

Anglican Theological Review

EDITED BY

FREDERICK C. GRANT AND BURTON S. EASTON

Founded by SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

VOLUME XX

JULY, 1938

NUMBER 3

A FEDERAL PLAN OF CHURCH UNITY

By WILLIAM MORROW WASHINGTON, Detroit, Michigan

The Episcopal Church holds to the conception of the church as a family; not an ideal family in its daily living, but a family nevertheless. More is to be said, however, upon the subject of our relation to other parts of God's family. The relation is a broken and unhappy one, with memories of past discord. There are many who pray for better relations and who ask on what terms those relations may be improved. With so many different kinds of human nature, so many forms of church government, so many varieties of doctrine involved, so many prejudices and so much stubborn pride to be softened—what possible form of union can be effected and by what method can it be achieved?

A federal plan of church unity is suggested. It seems to offer a unity that preserves the self-respect of the churches entering it and in other ways avoids offence to the sensibilities of Christians. It is offered for discussion. It is purposely vague; for only the denomination concerned can say on what terms it will enter into any form of unity with another.

The question this paper would propose is this: Will it be possible to achieve a form of unity which makes capital of the differences between denominations, using them as an

attractive feature of a plan of union and making only such changes in existing ecclesiastical institutions as may be agreed upon as necessary to the attainment of union? It is called a plan; but it is a method of approach, a point of view, rather than a plan.

I

Let us first get a picture of church life in a community in which the federal plan is in operation. We suppose ourselves in a town—say fifty years from the date of inauguration of the system—where there are congregations of the federal church. Stopping before various church buildings we notice that the sign boards proclaim them members of the united church. In smaller letters on one is the additional information that it belongs also to a certain denomination. We find that a number of the congregations have this double allegiance and find no inconsistency in the fact. Becoming acquainted with the various clergymen, pastors of these churches, we find that they recognise one another's orders because all actually have received ordination at the same hands, and not through a spirit of tolerance nor because in the eyes of the public "one minister is as good as another."

We ask laymen about their membership and find a recognition that all belong to one church: they are members of the united church. At the same time devotion manifests itself in loyalty to one congregation or even to a denomination. We attend worship and see important differences, but agreement as to a minimum of essentials in the administration of the sacraments of Baptism and Communion.

At the central offices of the united church we find a federal board which arranges with each denomination for the ordination of its candidates for the ministry and for the establishment of new missions. By these means there is assurance of a ministry of uniform spiritual commission and of the removal of the danger of overchurching in the mission field. These benefits are, however, only the beginning of those to be

obtained as the consequence of dwelling together in unity in obedience to our Lord's will.

II

As to the process by which this union might be realized, we can foretell that negotiations extending over many years would be necessary and that discussion would cover these points:

1. A doctrinal statement
2. The position of the Holy Scriptures
3. A common ordination to the ministry and arrangements to cover the period before the common ordination would be the rule
4. Agreement as to the establishment of new missionary work
5. Agreement as to institutions and invested funds
6. The constitution of the central authority and the nature of its powers

During these discussions it would become apparent what would be the contribution of each denomination to unity, what concessions and changes in its own point of view each would make for the sake of that unity. Under the agreement as finally made, according to the federal plan, each denomination would have the same liberty as at present, save that having accepted the federal plan each denomination would bind itself not to adopt thereafter anything contradictory to that plan. A denomination might add to the doctrinal statement for its own members, it might add to the requirements for the preparation of candidates for the ministry, or in other ways demonstrate its convictions and its liberty as at present, so long as it adhered to the constitution of the united church. In any case, whatever reunion is achieved will be by purely democratic and voluntary methods.

In brief, by a federal plan is meant one that achieves a desirable degree of unity and coöperation in essentials without the destruction or abandonment of non-essentials whose retention is desired on one side or another equally with the essentials.

The so-called non-essentials are in their way a most important phase of every part of human life. They are the

local color, so to speak, which gives joy and personal satisfaction in our emotional life. In religion they are the peculiarities of any denomination which attract and hold its members to that denomination rather than to another. Any agreement which should pare religion down to the minimum essentials on which all agree would leave a religion in which no one would be interested, which no one could love. It is of first importance therefore that those non-essentials shall be preserved—the peculiarities which make the Methodist love his Methodism, the Presbyterian his Presbyterianism, and so on for all the denominations.

The result of the acceptance of this principle is that under the federal plan each denomination retains its denominational name and organization. The worship of the denomination, containing those differences which have endeared its members to that church from childhood, remains the same as before union, making only such changes, if any are necessary, as will bring it into accord with the agreement freely made when the denomination entered the united church. The clergy gather in annual or other conventions as at present *by denominations*, and at the same time are represented by delegates in the united church. This arrangement follows upon the determination to give recognition to the cultural importance of the denomination and its traditions.

Furthermore each denomination continues to train its candidates for the ministry and to require its own doctrinal and practical conditions for ordination as an *addition* to the minimum requirements of the federal church. Each denomination continues to conduct its own missionary enterprise, subject only to agreement with the united church. And finally, each denomination raises and controls its own funds, including its endowments. The amount of missionary and publication work done by each continues to depend on the zeal, financial ability and generosity of those it appeals to. Its pension fund is used for its own aged and helpless clergy and their families. It continues to build and manage its own

institutions: schools, hospitals, orphanages, old people's homes, and refuges for the homeless and outcast.

III

If it be objected that this plan is not feasible, the answer is that it already is in operation. The Roman Catholic church in its relation to the orders, Dominican, Franciscan, and others, follows the practice, though not the principle, of the federal church. A clergyman of that church decides sooner or later whether he will be a "secular" priest or a "regular" priest, belonging to one of the orders. In the latter case he submits voluntarily to additional requirements, the *regulæ* of the order, whose acceptance makes him a "regular" priest. The *regulæ* are both the plan of work of the order and his own rule of life. The work of the order may be that of parish priests, or it may be devotional, missionary, educational, charitable—or it may be a combination of some of these.

The order having been authorized by the pope may enter a diocese only at the invitation of the bishop and pursue its special work. Once established in the diocese, however, the order has a large degree of independence. The clergy of the order meet in separate conclave and each order by its own method appoints priests to carry on its work. The *regulæ* may call for a certain degree of democracy in the internal conduct and functioning of the order. Pastors over parish churches in its care are appointed by the order, not by the bishop, but with his approval. The order collects and handles its own funds and keeps title to them, except in the case of parish churches. It trains its own candidates for the ministry, promotes its own devotional services, and issues its own publications for educational and propaganda purposes. There is unity with the whole church, in doctrine of faith and morals, in the matters of ordination, of lay-membership, and of effort in building up the church. At the same time there is clear recognition of the demand of human nature for differences of

method according to the differing needs and dispositions of people. In a real sense the Roman Catholic diocese may be called a federal church in its method of operation.

IV

Not only may the federal plan be considered feasible, but if it is not so, we may say with some certainty that no other is feasible. This may be the lesson to be learned from the negotiations in promotion of the South India scheme. Of this plan the Lambeth Conference has said: "We approve the method of proceeding towards union by means of a pledge given in mutual trust, to respect the long-established traditions and conscientious convictions of the uniting churches." This must be said with an eye to the future. That is, if a considerable denomination is to have its long-established traditions and conscientious convictions respected, that will mean liberty to continue those traditions and convictions in the future, as the holder of them may desire or consider his duty. And that can be accomplished, in all probability, by nothing less than the preservation of the organization within which those traditions and convictions have grown and developed.

On the other hand, the rejection of the federal principle means that hope for the accomplishment of unity is to be placed either upon absorption by one denomination of all others or on individual clergy asking for a common ordination. Either of these is an illusory prospect. A third method would result from the coming together of those churches that hold to the same theory or method of ordination. This indeed is to some extent already taking place, episcopal churches getting into communion with episcopal, and those holding to presbyterian ordination uniting among themselves. This movement, however, can achieve in the nature of the case only a partial unity, no matter how far it may go in that particular direction; it may achieve horizontal but not vertical unity.

V

THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH AND THE FEDERAL PLAN

The Lambeth Quadrilateral of the Anglican Communion still stands and the church probably sees no reason for altering its position with regard to it. Progress has been made, however, since it was issued. The General Convention has recognised in various canons or resolutions the acceptability of a congregation that places itself under the care of a bishop but does not use the Prayer Book. Conversely, a minister having episcopal ordination may minister in a congregation that does not use the Prayer Book. There is nothing also to prevent a minister having two ordinations, episcopal and non-episcopal, and carrying on his ministry without renouncing or slurring either of them. So far this situation does not apply to a denomination as such, but only to congregations and individual ministers.

There are along the Atlantic seaboard parishes which have never united with the diocesan convention, though they are typical Episcopal parishes in every other respect. They are perhaps a hangover from the time when ancient parishes preferred not to yield up the freedom which they had known in Colonial days and convention and bishop accepted the situation through necessity. But now perhaps it can be capitalized: from the beginning parishes have enjoyed all the spiritual privileges of church life without coming formally into the church through union with the convention. Perhaps a principle may be here set up for a new relationship between the Episcopal Church and other churches—a relationship that shall consist in its essence of the acceptance by both parties of the bishop as the ordaining functionary, with the possibility that there be no other connection between them.

The greatest practical problem, from the standpoint of the Episcopal Church, would be found here, in the question of the place of bishops in the federal church. We may be sure the "historic episcopate" of the Lambeth Articles would be

interpreted by the Episcopal Church to mean at least that no future ordination should take place without a bishop, assisted by presbyters; just as on the other hand we may be sure no denomination is going to agree to the reordination of its clergy. Would the House of Bishops be content, while acting as the ordaining authority of the united church, to continue in other respects as the upper house of the Episcopal Church (considered as a denomination within the united church)?

This leads us to consider the composition of the central authority. There would doubtless be bishops on that board, but they need not rule it any more than bishops rule the Episcopal Church either in their own dioceses or in the National Council. Indeed, any central authority we can imagine would be composed very much as is the National Council of the Episcopal Church, of bishops, presbyters, and laymen. The question as to the part the bishops would play in the united church government outside their own dioceses seems to offer no greater difficulties than does the composition of the National Council, with this exception, that in the National Council the bishops are represented proportionately to presbyters and laymen. Whereas in the united church's central authority the Episcopal Church would be the only one represented by bishops—except in the event other churches decide to seek Catholic consecration for their bishops.

Another consideration is the fact that though the Episcopal Church would insist on bishops as the ordaining authority, there is no reason to think that all bishops of a federal church would continue to be chosen from the Episcopal Church. Even if the other churches should be willing to have ordination conferred by bishops of the Catholic tradition, it seems likely that they would sooner or later wish orders conferred by men of their own denomination—that they would object to their own clergy having no part in ordinations except as presbyterial assistants to the bishop of the Episcopal Church. They might object also that in the central authority the Episcopal

Church should be the only one represented by bishops—and this in spite of a fundamental disbelief on their part in three orders in the ministry.

The prospect reminds us of Dr. Muhlenberg's suggestion that the House of Bishops declare itself as an apostolic college free to carry on Christ's work by ordaining men in any denomination as they might think to be good for the cause of Christ.

The sum total of these reflections is the recognition of enormous difficulties, and the question: If we separate the cause of Christ from that of our own pride, can the difficulties be ironed out and made to disappear?

Church Congress Syllabus No. 2

THE CONTENT OF AND AUTHORITY FOR
CHRISTIAN EVANGELISM

PART IV. THE VALIDITY OF THE CONSTANT EMPHASIS
IN CHRISTIAN EVANGELISM IN THE LIGHT OF
CONTEMPORARY CRITICISM

By P. M. RHINELANDER, Eastern Point, Gloucester, Mass.

I. WAGGETT'S DICHOTOMY

My point of departure is a proposition which I owe entirely to Philip Waggett whose work in the field of Christian Apologetics is perhaps not so well known as it deserves to be. It runs as follows: Christians of whatever name fall into two classes: (1) those who think of Christianity as a system of ideas mediated from mind to mind, and (2) those who conceive of, and define it, as a communicated life.¹ Waggett, that is to say, sees a primary dichotomy underlying all differences and diversities of creed and cult, of groupings or denominations. All Christians everywhere and always belong or have belonged in one or the other of these classes.

I take this striking dictum as a point of departure only. I am not concerned to discuss or defend all its implications. Taken by itself it may raise more questions than it answers. But it indicates a line of thought which is certainly germane to our subject, and which I think is not commonly given its due weight in current exposition of Christian faith and practice.

Expand this dichotomy of Waggett a little further. On the one hand Christianity is held to be a system of ideas,

¹ See especially P. N. Waggett, *The Age of Decision*, pp. 25-27. The same idea is found in various forms in his other writings, especially in *Science and Religion*, *The Scientific Temper in Religion*, and *The Holy Eucharist*.

whether theological or ethical, or both. The ideas, of course, must be characteristically Christian ideas of God, of man, of immortality, of righteousness, of sin, of redemption, of salvation and so on down the list of what Christians in general hold true. These ideas must be brought together into some comprehensive formulary sufficiently distinctive to be identified as Christian. So that one can say to an inquirer: "Do you want to know what Christianity is? Here it is in the most convenient form. Adopt these ideas as your own and you will be a Christian, as you would be an Hegelian if you made that great philosopher's ideas your own, or a 'Deweyite' if you adopted Professor Dewey's system of thought as mediated from his mind to yours." Clearly this is to move in a philosophic atmosphere. It is a philosophical approach to Christianity.

On the other hand, Christianity may be conceived as a communicated life. At once one is in a wholly different atmosphere. Here is no philosophy as such, no system of abstract ideas. We may have no notion of what life is. Its definition may entirely elude us. But certainly life is more than an idea. It is the most concrete of realities. To conceive of the Christian gospel as a communicated life commits us so far to a biological² approach. And biology is not philosophy, but science. Its subject matter includes all the observed phenomena of life on every level, that is, all we

² This use of biology as connoting spiritual as well as physical processes seems not only justified but of real importance at the present time. On the one hand the best Christian thought is realizing and seeking to formulate the cosmic implications of a faith which has its center in an historic Incarnation. On the other hand, non-Christian and even non-theistic thought is tending towards the conception of an organic universe. It should be noted also that biology as a purely "natural" science is still chiefly occupied with the study of life on its lower rather than on its higher levels. To the professional biologist man as marking "the highest stage in the drama of ascending life" is still, as Carrel calls him, "the unknown." In the same way it would help to clarify our thought if anthropology were taken to include not only the social structures which were the organs of man's primitive life but also the structure which is the organ of man's Christian life, i.e. the Church.

have come to know of life as a reality; not as an idea, but as a fact.

Waggett contends that this biological interpretation of the Gospel has behind it the witness both of history and of experience. The present essay, in support of this contention, is a grateful acknowledgement as from a pupil to a master. I have cast it in suggestive rather than argumentative form. As I have said, the line of thought here presented is not commonly found or followed in current expositions of the Christian faith. I hope to provoke discussion along lines which, if my own experience is any guide, cannot fail to be enlightening in our search for methods by which to commend the Gospel to men of our day who are perplexed in mind as to what is to be believed and yet ready in will to welcome a faith which meets them on familiar ground and holds promise of intellectual and spiritual satisfaction.

II. ADVANTAGES OF A BIOLOGICAL APPROACH

To indicate what the advantages of a biological approach to the Gospel may prove to be in clarifying faith and simplifying thought, five headings, or propositions, are tentatively listed for separate consideration, as follows:

1. *It brings the Gospel into realistic touch with every day experience.*

For sheer realism, life, as a category of human experience, has no rivals. It is the one "datum" which has primary significance for the whole race; for oriental as for occidental; for the "wise" and "mighty" as for the "weak" and "foolish." In the nurture and training of children; in the planting and raising of crops and flowers; in the care of farm stock and household pets; in the pursuit of health and the avoidance of disease; life at some level, probably at several levels, occupies the time and thought of everybody every day. If the Gospel can be defined in terms of a communicated life it will come home to men in the most familiar of all guises.

We may have been frightened off this line of thought by fear of "mysticism," which to many means irrational and uncontrolled fantasy or fancy; "the stuff that dreams are made of." Undoubtedly we should be on our guard against this type of mysticism. But we should remember on the other hand that in any case and for every one of us, the most familiar things, like love and will, like space and time, are the most mysterious. "Exeunt omnia in mysterium." But that is only half the truth and the less important half. Not only do all things end, as they begin, in mystery but every day and in every day's concerns, we are living quite simply, naturally, and realistically in the midst of mystery. The very elements which make up our human nature—which make our nature human—are beyond our comprehension. Yet they are there. They are given. They are immediately present. We cannot get away from them. We cannot draw off and observe and analyze them from outside. We start with them. With them we build up the whole fabric of experience, as children in the nursery build up all manner of projects with the blocks which have been given them, without knowing the nature of the blocks or where they come from. If we are looking for reality or realism (in this context either word will serve) we shall find it in our familiar experience of, and with, the mysteries of living. And of all life's mysteries life itself is the most mysterious as it is the most familiar. Its mystery and its familiarity are the two sides of the same shield. If then the Gospel, in very truth, can be set forth in terms of life; that is, as an increase or reenforcement, not of the means of living or of livelihood, but of life itself, it will be more instantly *apprehended*, though at the same time more outside the range of *comprehension*, than if interpreted in any other way.

2. *It makes clear the practical aim of Christian Doctrine.*

Doctrine has an unpleasant sound in many ears. It has had of late a slight return to popular approval. Still there is

a widespread prejudice against it. This prejudice like most prejudices seems to be not so much a reasoned judgment as an emotional reaction. As such it usually has something to say in self-defense. For, speaking generally, those who dislike doctrine are disliking something which ought to be disliked. They have come to think of doctrine as a kind of abstract "metaphysics" (whatever that may mean) which is hard to understand and has no bearing on the practical problems and concerns of every day. Now if that were really true, Christian doctrine would indeed be the enemy, and not the friend, of discipleship and faith. But surely there must be some misunderstanding. For in the last analysis doctrine is just another name for teaching, and no one has ever become a Christian unless taught, or indoctrinated in, the Christian faith. Now Christian teaching aims to influence human behaviour or, to put it differently, to lead men to change their ways of living. Nothing could be more practical than that. And if doctrine and teaching are the same, then authentic Christian doctrine is intensely practical.

This is not the place to show how the common misunderstanding as to doctrine has arisen. But it is important that the misunderstanding should be removed. The second advantage of the suggested biological interpretation of the Gospel is precisely that it does remove this misunderstanding and makes it clear that the aim of Christian doctrine is altogether practical.

At this point an illustration—a parable at some length from electricity—may help my meaning. I am at my desk and in the dark and I need light. I turn a switch and the light comes. I may know nothing of electrical science but none the less I am its beneficiary. I know the formula for getting light. I turn the switch.

Now behind that shining bulb over my desk there is a long and fascinating history. Follow it one step back and we find ourselves in the factory where bulbs are made. The machines have been constructed according to exact specifications. The

men who work them are told exactly what to do. These *purveyors* of bulbs have their formulas to follow just as I, sitting at my desk, have mine.

Now go back one further step. We find the whole scene changed. Now we are with men who are not working *with*, but working *out* the formulas. They are the *pioneers* of bulb making. They have one sure conviction to begin with. They know that electricity gives light. Their problem is to make this light-giving quality of electricity available for human use. Gradually, by experiment after experiment, they penetrate into the laws which govern electricity. They learn how it can be controlled and used. Finally, they reach a formula for making bulbs, a formula which sums up all they have discovered, and which they can pass on to the makers and distributors who in turn will provide me with the light over my desk.

But for the complete story of the bulb we must go still further back. Behind the pioneers are the *explorers*. The pioneers had the fact of electricity given to them. It was there ready to be used, if only men could find the way to use it. The explorers had nothing given them but an intuition.³ They began with an hypothesis or, if you like, with a mere guess. An indication here, an observation there, led them to believe that there was present and at work in our universe a mysterious force or energy which had not yet come into scientific calculation but which if established as a fact might be of extraordinary significance. And the guess was verified, the hypothesis proved to be well founded. Observed facts in nature, not heretofore accounted for, not linked up with other facts, fell into place. The discovery of electricity made

³ In his *Scientific Temper in Religion* (pp. 43-46) Waggett notes that the great changes in men's conception of the universe have come from something akin to inspiration, "in minds specially enlightened, specially in tune with the realities of the physical world." This is an important and suggestive thought. It indicates what we are much tempted to forget, viz. that the great discoveries and advances of natural science in recent years have had their origin in what were, in point of fact, "adventures of faith."

the natural order as a whole more coherent and intelligible. It gave man a better knowledge of his physical environment, and that new knowledge in turn has given him new and unimagined power to achieve his purposes and to work his will.

So we can block out the history of the electric bulb. First came the *explorers* who verified a great hypothesis. Next came the *pioneers* who worked out the formulas by which this new-found energy became available for men. Then followed the makers or *purveyors* who, following these formulas, fashioned the instruments by which electric light is brought to human homes, so that I can have a light over my desk.

I think it not fanciful to find in this story of the electric bulb an analogy to the historic Christian creed both in content and in structure. The first paragraph of the Creed tells us of God, Father and Creator. In those words is condensed the consenting witness of the seers and prophets of the ages, which became most articulate and clear in Israel. Call it the creed of the *explorers*, the verification in experience of the hypothesis that God exists. There is so far no Christianity as such, no hint, that is, that men on earth can now, with a new certainty and confidence, establish personal contact with God in Heaven.

Then comes the second paragraph. Very briefly it summarizes the Gospel story, and reminds us, in so doing, of the way in which a few unlettered men whom our Lord had chosen to be with Him, had been led gradually to discern in Him the link between humanity and Godhead. Their creed in its first, undeveloped form can be summed up in two words: *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*. But from that audacious and revolutionary faith, as from a fruitful seed, came the articulated Apostolic creed of Christendom. The Apostles can therefore be called the *pioneers* of Christian faith.

So much we learn from the second paragraph. But there is so far no explanation as to how this discovery made by that small band of men can be significant for other men at other

times—for us in our time. We learn what happened, and what men believed, two thousand years ago. But as yet there is no hint of any bridge across the centuries by crossing which the Jesus of the Gospels can come to mean as much to us as He did to the Apostles. If the creed ended there, if Christian doctrine had no more to tell us, it would be open to the charge that it brings no gift, no special grace to us, but only exalted ideas of an exalted God and the memory of a perfect human life, so perfect and unique that those who knew it best found Deity itself revealed in it.

But in the third paragraph is found the solution of the difficulty, the meeting of our spiritual need. By the Holy Spirit and through the Holy Church all men everywhere and always can have fellowship with the Father and the Son. Pentecost, that is, marks the beginning of what came to be known as Christianity. As Bishop Gore was fond of saying: "The true definition of a Christian is one who has received The Holy Spirit." The Spirit-bearing Church is thus the *purveyor* of the gift of the new life.

To point the parable, let me summarize as follows: From "this mysterious universe," through the ministries of explorers, pioneers, and purveyors, light comes to me that even in the darkness I may see. From the mysterious God, Father and Creator, revealed to, discovered by, explorer-prophets; through Jesus Christ, believed in by pioneer-apostles as the Lord Who, "manhood to deliver, manhood did put on"; by virtue of my membership in His "beloved community" wherein His Spirit dwells, "dividing to every man severally as He wills," new life has been communicated to me in my sinfulness and weakness so that I may be "a new creation."⁴

⁴ The parable from electricity is of course quite inadequate. It must not be pressed. It carries static and mechanical implications which can have no place in the spiritual order. Yet it has value as showing that authentic Christian doctrine (1) has no speculative element or interest but (2) is simply a record, or certification, of God's past and present dramatic activity towards men.

Christian doctrine then aims at this one great practical and final end: that from the Father, through His Son, and in His Fellowship, new life from the Life-given may re-create man's nature.

3. *It integrates the witness of the whole New Testament.*

A biological interpretation of the Gospel would seem to make room for all the varying accents of Apostolic teaching, showing them to be complementary and not contradictory or inconsistent. The perennial problem confronting serious New Testament students is, how far can the obvious diversity of teaching in the different books be brought into a convincing harmony? This problem is quite different from, and far more important than, the reconciliation of historical contradictions and inconsistencies. For upon its solution depends the identification of authentic Christianity, or, in other words, the right answer to the question, "What is Christianity?" It is true that the average reader of the New Testament is not as a rule conscious of the problem. He takes what he likes and leaves the rest and probably finds edification and spiritual nourishment in so doing. It is also to be noted that, in the past, indeed up to very recent times, many, perhaps a majority of, learned and professional New Testament exegetes have been guided by the same subjective principle. They, no doubt unconsciously and indeed against their own declared principles of scientific and historical detachment, have found in the New Testament what they have brought to it. Hence has arisen the strife of tongues and the conflict between schools which have perplexed and distressed the faithful—those among us who would be "quiet in the land."

In very recent years, however, a new spirit seems to be abroad among our learned leaders in New Testament interpretation. There is a new and very hopeful willingness to recognize the fact that the Christian tradition, if fairly surveyed as a whole, does as a matter of fact form a massive and impressive unity, and that, therefore, the key to the true

reading of the New Testament must be looked for in some formula of interpretation which will include and do full justice to all the dominating strains in that tradition, however much on the surface they may appear as independent of and at variance with one another.

I would suggest that our formula of "a communicated life" fits the situation to a nicety. The Jesus of the Gospels, the Christ of the Acts and the Epistles, the "moralism" of St James; the "mysticism" of the Epistle to the Hebrews; the "sacramentalism" of the Johannine writings; the social gospel of the Epistle to the Ephesians—all these fit into a single frame and make up one coherent whole if all are interpreted in terms of a communicated life, which was first promised and prepared for, and then freely and fully given, to the Christian fellowship.

The promise and the preparation are recorded in the Gospels but not the actual giving of the gift. That is for the future. It lies outside the proper limits of the Gospel history. The Gospels themselves end on the note of expectation. Meanwhile they tell us how the way was opened for the coming fulfilment of the promise, for the actual bestowal of the gift. The reality of the new life was first made manifest in our Lord's own spirit-filled humanity. Taking on Himself our human nature, weakened as it was by sin, He purged it from every fault and flaw by His unfaltering obedience "to death, even the death of the Cross." So, by His resurrection and ascension, He won His way to His personal exaltation as man, or rather, to the exaltation of humanity in Him. In Him, therefore, is shown once for all the true meaning and capacity of human nature. As must be true in every genuine evolutionary process, man finds his definition not in his origin but in his goal; not in any anthropoid from which his physical descent is to be traced, but in Jesus Christ the one, true, perfect, full-grown *normal* man. Our Lord's own personal perfection, however, was the beginning, not the ending, of this new stage in the history of life. He was not *receiver*

only, He was to be *author* also. From Him as head of a new creation, i.e. of a new order of humanity, was to go out to the community of His faithful people that new energy of life with which He Himself, as man, had been endowed. Christians were thenceforth to be heirs of that Eternal Life which God through the Church was now ready and able to bestow.⁵

All I have said here is in the merest outline. To fill it in, to show how the doctrine of the Church, of the sacraments, of the ministry, how every other item of the authentic Creed fits into it, would require many essays such as this, if not a new "Summa" of theology. All that is here intended is to suggest that the formula of a communicated life does seem to offer a line of exploration into the whole field of Christian doctrine which may make clear the fundamental unity of our faith as it has come to us in unbroken tradition from Apostolic witness.

4. *It explains and interprets the dominant note in the historic worship of the Church.*

It is certainly true that "if one would understand the Church's faith, one must listen to her at her prayers." It is equally certain that the heart of the Church's worship is to be found through all the centuries in her eucharistic liturgy. It would be impossible within our limits to analyze the liturgy in its several parts. Nor is it necessary. For the liturgy as a whole, at least in what may be called its classic forms, has a marked unity of structure. Its dominant theme is the celebration of God's gracious activities in man's behalf, leading up with solemn emphasis and in dramatic detail to the Institution of the Sacrament, and then passing on to a remembrance of and thanksgiving for the Resurrection and Ascension and the coming of the Holy Spirit by Whom God's gifts are consecrated for our use, and in Whom we have fellow-

⁵ This great subject, so lightly touched on here, is considered at length, and in an illuminating way, by L. S. Thornton, *The Incarnate Lord*, ch. xv (especially pp. 432-451).

ship or union with the Father and the Son and with our fellow Christians.

All such language is, of course, saturated with theology, and if abstracted from its realistic context might be difficult of interpretation. But the concrete and dramatic acts on the part of both priest and people make its meaning quite clear and unmistakable. Because of what God through our Lord has done for us in the past, and once for all, there is now offered to the whole body of the faithful everywhere and always a gift of surpassing value and significance. His people come together in His sanctuary not only to receive the gift, but, in receiving it, and by receiving it, to return Him worthy thanks for this inestimable benefit. And the gift, though it may be described and celebrated in many different terms, is fundamentally a gift of life communicated in the Eucharist by our Lord to His faithful fellowship on earth.

Even a casual reading of our own liturgy will show not only how often the word life, with its synonyms⁶ and relatives, recurs, but also how the whole atmosphere is eloquent of a reinforced vitality, of new relationships, new resolutions, new aspirations, new insights, and new energies.

The Church has always found it difficult to reach any adequate definition of its faith in the Third Person of the Trinity, in God the Holy Ghost. But in calling Him and praying to Him as Life-Giver, it has gathered up all its experience of blessing and enlightenment into one single word. If then we do listen to the Church at her prayers, we shall hear her through the ages praising God for the life He has communicated.

⁶ The Old Testament identification of *blood* with *life* ("the blood is the life thereof") was carried over into the New Testament and then into the usage of the Church, especially in its liturgy and hymns. Medical science of late has approached closely to the same identification. In Mrs Alexander's well-known hymn, for instance, the line, "Saved by His precious blood," could find no more illuminating comment or analogy than in the modern practice of preserving life by blood-transfusions.

5. *It justifies the claim that the Christian Gospel is permanently valid.*

St Paul in his letter to the Roman Christians uses a striking phrase: "The law of the Spirit of Life which is in Christ Jesus." The illuminating word here is the word "law." The "Spirit of Life" means in this context the characteristic grace-gift which has come to Christians through their Lord. This "Spirit of Life" is under law. That is St Paul's point. It functions in fixed and ordered ways. It fits into the whole system of established law by which God rules His whole creation. Indeed, St Paul would probably have insisted that the reign of law, freely working for the accomplishment of God's good will, is to be seen in its perfection not in the physical, but only in the spiritual order.⁷ In other words, God's great controlling purpose for His people as for His universe is being worked out, and carried to its completion not at haphazard, not by desperate expedients and interventions, but under the silent, majestic, inevitable reign of law. The Gospel is supernatural in its very essence inasmuch as it supervenes on nature in order to raise nature to a level which, by itself, nature could not reach. None the less, the Gospel is an integral part of one great all-inclusive process which has the living God as source, and as its goal the re-creation of men to be in very deed and truth God's children.

The Gospel of Redemption is not isolated from, still less contradictory of, the Gospel of Creation. In the whole history of life on earth, in the entire biological sequence which we are learning to trace with increasing accuracy, the Gospel plays its part; its necessary and transcendently important part. The passage from inanimate to animate creation, from cell to organism, from plant to animal, from animal to man, marks one unbroken, indivisible process each step of which is bound up with all the other steps by the majestic

⁷ Of Henry Drummond's well-known book, *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*, it has been said that its chief fault lies in its title, which should have been reversed so as to read, "Spiritual Law in the Natural World."

permanence of a unifying law. If, then, a new level of life is attainable by Christians, if by our Lord there is communicated, or communicable, a "more abundant life" (in the literal meaning of the words), then the Gospel which proclaims it and makes it available for men has the same permanent validity as the great moment in the story of creation when a mammal found himself raised to the dignity of man. And it is worth noting that such an interpretation of the Gospel is congruous with the accepted teachings of biology, or rather that the teachings of biology are entirely congruous with our interpretation of the Gospel. Professor Julian Huxley in his latest book on *The Story of Evolution* speaks of the advent of *homo sapiens* as "the last stage in the drama of ascending life." So far, so good. But in our view *homo sapiens* is not the last stage. There is another, and the highest stage of all, in the development of life, namely, the stage at which *homo sapiens* becomes *homo Christianus*.⁸ As St Paul puts it, "the gift of God is *eternal* life, through Jesus Christ Our Lord."

Briefly to summarize. The veritable Gospel is that in our Lord a new Life has been implanted in humanity; that this life is continually present in His Body the Church and comes to the individual as he is "grafted" into that Body as a living member. That is the contention of this essay. How convincingly can it defend itself in the face of contemporary criticism?

III. CONTEMPORARY CRITICISM AND A PLEA IN CONFESSION AND AVOIDANCE

Contemporary criticism of Christianity is chiefly on the score of ineffectiveness. This does not mean that other doubts

⁸ Discontinuity in evolution is so generally accepted as a fact that one feels justified in taking it for granted without further argument. The problem is how to account for it. The theistic explanation is not capable of logical or scientific proof or disproof. Yet even from a purely philosophical point of view it helps us more than any other "to think things together." In any case for Christian faith Pentecost marks the crown and consummation of the biological process as we know it.

and difficulties are held to have been solved. It does mean that the other problems, for the time being, have become secondary in the face of the world's appalling need of some regenerating moral and spiritual force and the Church's apparent failure to supply it.

Experts in their classrooms and their studies are exercised as much as ever over the trustworthiness of Christian records; the relation of Christianity to other religions and to other faiths; the reality of freedom within the reign of law; the significance of the religious impulse; the primacy of spirit over matter or of matter over spirit; the evidence for theism and, in particular, the reasonable possibility of an historic Incarnation. But at the moment the Christian apologist is not primarily concerned with any of these things. He has to face what seems a more devastating criticism, namely, a threatened judgment based on what is held to be convincing evidence that Christianity, especially since the Great War, has lost its hold on man's allegiance and is no longer to be trusted as a guide out of the overwhelming difficulties of our day.

The evidence on which this judgment rests is very personal and very simple. Christians do not seem to be better than non-Christians. They are not preëminent in either individual or social virtues. They are not more sensitive than others to human needs and not more eager and devoted in the struggle for social justice and equality of opportunity. They lay claim to a special revelation of God's will and to special spiritual graces and endowment. But nothing seems to come of it except an increase of selfish pride in alleged privilege.

Such a judgment presses with peculiar force upon those of us who hold to the interpretation of the Gospel advocated in this essay. Do Christians as a rule seem to be people of a new birth, men and women to whom has been communicated new spiritual vitality which is to prove itself, not merely at special times and seasons, not in occasional and spasmodic acts of worship and devotion, but in the habitual expression both in

word and deed of a new inward spirit which has reformed the character?

What shall we say? Borrowing a legal phrase, our best hope lies in a "plea in confession and avoidance." We dare not deny the charge of failure and unfaithfulness. Were there evidence in refutation of it we dare not use it. Even had we done all that it was our duty to do we should still be "unprofitable servants." The Church is the communion of saints only because God in His mercy "deals with us not as we are but as we are becoming." From the human point of view we know ourselves to be a fellowship of sinners. Our first answer then to the charge of ineffectiveness must be a full and frank confession. Such confession will be a sign not of weakness but of strength. For penitence is not a door or gate which, having passed through, the Christian leaves behind him. It is rather a sign that he is courageously facing the truth both of God and of himself. As he advances in the way of truth so will his penitence increase, as a light casts the deepest shadows behind those objects which are nearest to it. After confession made, our "plea in avoidance" follows in four parts.

First. The reality of God's grace is not disproved by man's refusal or abuse of it. No doubt men can commit suicide but only because they have been given the gift of life. And the air is there for us to breathe quite independently of our breathing. In its widest sense God's grace means His providence and His "prevenience." He is the source and origin of all that is. He takes the initiative in everything. Man's part can never be more than a response. God supplies the environment, physical and spiritual, which has in it what we need for our well-being. But we must adjust ourselves to it, else it will be for us an environment of death and not of life. In the incisive words of Holy Writ we may "judge ourselves unworthy of eternal life." But that judgment implies that eternal life could have been ours for the asking. There has indeed been ineffectiveness and failure but it is Christians

who have failed, not Christianity. "Let God be true and every man a liar."

Secondly. The "peculiar difference" of a truly Christian character bears witness to an inward regeneration or renewal. There seems no other adequate account to give of it. In the typical Christian "saint," whether on the Church's official calendar or found among the "hidden servants" of our own acquaintance, *holiness* is close akin to *wholeness*, making us realize, as perhaps nothing else could do, that the proper meaning of salvation is the recovery by the grace of God of complete spiritual health. In the saints, human nature appears renovated, each faculty quickened, each relationship, each duty, fulfilled with a zeal which is almost without effort, and with a joy which is immune to pain and sorrow. It is not so much that the saints do new and unexpected things, though they are always prepared for new adventures, or that they achieve new virtues. It is rather that they do the old and ordinary things in a new way and give to the old virtues new depth and intensity of meaning. There will always be devout souls who seek and find salvation in withdrawal from the world. In the Christian economy there is always room for such. We are told that our Lord Himself counselled and approved a very radical asceticism. "If thy right hand—or thy right eye—cause thee to stumble, cast it from thee. It is better to enter into life halt or blind"—it is *better* but not *best*. World-renunciation is not the key-note or ideal of Christian sanctity. Christianity indeed, at its very heart, is other-worldly. "Our citizenship is in heaven." But true Christian other-worldliness gives a grace of loving insight and sympathetic understanding which marks this present world as the immediate scene of sacrifice and service. It cannot be otherwise for believers in the Incarnate Lord. For His Incarnation had as its immediate objective the setting up of the kingdom of heaven upon earth. To extend that kingdom is the primary privilege and duty of each citizen. And it is for this that men and women need to be renewed by a new gift of life. "I live,

yet not I but Christ liveth in me." St Paul's exalted words are not to be dismissed as the rapt expression of a momentary ecstasy. Rather they rehearse the experience common to all saints, that some measure of the life of Christ has been communicated to them.

Thirdly. The Church as "the fellowship of the redeemed" has within it the latent power to redeem society. History, on an impartial survey, seems to make this clear. The abiding influence of the Church upon the outside world has come from the new pattern of social life which it has set before men. The most difficult and pressing of human problems is the right adjustment of the individual to the group of which he is a member. As that group expands, from family to community or tribe, then to state or nation, and finally to international relations, so the problem becomes more and more acute. And what men are looking for, but never finding, is not a satisfying "ideology" but an actual demonstration. They want to come into contact with, and then to be included in, a fellowship in which men of all sorts and conditions are living together in unity and peace; in which a stable and secure adjustment has been found between the loyalties and obligations of their common life and the inherent right of every individual to free personal development.

Here lies the explanation of the magnetic attraction which the Church of the first days had for the diverse cultures and social traditions of the Roman Empire. Christianity was first known as "the Way." The word described not merely a new code of individual behavior, but, even more, a new pattern which offered a working solution of the social problem. "See how these Christians love one another." That popular comment on the early Church meant more than mere admiration or approval. It meant at first a hope, then a conviction, that human society might be redeemed and that the Christian Church was the redeeming agency. And so it proved. In spite of the bitter wars and tumults, the fierce rivalries and fanatical divisions which have afflicted Christendom, the

Christian Church has been the teacher, because it has been the exemplar, of the social redemption of mankind. At the present time the Church is under fire especially for its social ineffectiveness. Yet the social standards and ideals on which the Church's critics base their criticism are the very standards and ideals which the Church has taught the world and which the world never would have assimilated but for the Church's witness. It may well be that the very sharpness of the present criticism to which the Church is subject comes from men's deep-rooted, if unavowed, conviction that the Church still has within it a regenerating social power, but is not using it; that if the Church fails in its social mission, then men will not know where to turn.

Fourthly and finally. There is still inherent in the Christian Church the power to redeem society—and *it is nowhere else*. That is a bold assertion. Is it true? Take first the negation, *it is nowhere else*. There will be vehement protests especially from those who think, or say they think, that one or other of present-day revolutionary social programs will bring Utopia. The very vehemence of such protests renders them a little suspect, and it is noticeable that the ardent advocates of these modern social revolutions recognize the need of apology or explanation. It is not all clear sailing for them. The usual defensive plea is that emergencies require immediate and arbitrary action. Intensive espionage, secret trials, "purgings," wholesale imprisonments and persecutions, killings which are sometimes nothing less than massacres; these things in themselves may not be defensible, but they are justified for the sake of the great end which cannot be reached in any other way. So runs the plea. But this line of argument is surely a heavily-weighted boomerang which recoils with deadly force on those who use it. For the maxim that the end justifies the means is not only immoral. It is fundamentally untrue. The truth is that ends are always judged and shown in their true colours by the means which serve them. An end which can be reached by evil means is itself evil. St Paul is not too

severe in his denunciation of those who advocate doing evil that good may come, "whose condemnation is just." Perhaps the most disturbing sign of our moral deterioration—of "the collapse of conscience" as it has been called—is that the so-called social conscience in these present days runs roughshod over the dictates of that still, small voice which says to every man, "As you value your personal integrity, as you would save your soul, do this; do not do that." If this inner voice of conscience in the individual is first disregarded, and then silenced (and this in the supposed interest of a better social order), then the final distinction between men and animals will have disappeared. The work waiting to be done will be more like the reclaiming of the jungle than the redemption of society.

After all, these new social programs are not really new, save in their terminology. All have been tried before. All have failed and left men restless, eager, almost desperate in their search for a social order which shall be truly human and humane. The verdict of history is to the effect that every social program which is the product or projection of man's unaided wit and unregenerated will, is inevitably bound to fail.

So the Christian Church is left as man's sole hope of permanent and satisfying social reconstruction. And the Church, if true to itself, will step into the breach, proclaiming its inherent power to redeem man's social life.

But is the power really there? On the evidence it is certainly a reasonable faith. To spiritually open minds, the evidence must be convincing. Redemption to be effectual must be social as well as individual. This follows from man's nature. For every man comes into the world not as a single, independent unit but as a member of society. His individual life is derived from an antecedent social union, and his very personality or character is shaped and coloured in large measure by what we call heredity. The family, not the individual, is the cell of the whole social structure. The

stream of life reaches the individual through social channels. That is the law in the physical order and the spiritual order does not contradict the physical.⁹ This leads us to the true function of the Church. It is in the world to be the agency through which the Holy Spirit, the Giver of the new life, works for the redemption of man's social life so that men and women, by virtue of their membership, may find their individual salvation. The Church is truly the fellowship of sinners, but of sinners who have been redeemed. And the plan and purpose of God's love for man is that this fellowship of the redeemed shall keep on growing till it reach "from the one sea to the other and from the river unto the world's end."

We hold then to our conclusion. There is in the Christian Church the power to redeem society—and it is nowhere else. Neglect of it, practical denial of it, cannot diminish or destroy it. Now and always it is there in full supply. Our denials and neglects involve us in grave moral and spiritual risk and will surely bring us into judgment. But God's purpose and provision for His kingdom will neither change nor fail.

And this power in the Church for the redemption of society is the power of a communicated life which through our Lord has become the heritage of all his faithful people. That life has been communicated to the Church not for the Church alone but for the world. But it cannot be communicated to the world unless contacts are made and channels cleared. And that is not God's responsibility but ours.

⁹ Law in this context can mean only God's regularity of operation, both in creation and redemption, as observed or experienced by man. God's freedom is not limited or compromised.

QUESTIONS SUGGESTED FOR DISCUSSION

1. What are the different meanings of the phrase "The Life of Christ" and which meaning has most significance for the Christian faith?

2. "Christian doctrines are statements about God's activity in meeting human needs through our Lord."

(a) What were the dominant themes of first-century Christian preaching?

(b) What human needs was it chiefly concerned with and addressed to?

(c) What are the corresponding needs which trouble men today?

(d) Can these needs be met by materials supplied in the (earthly) "Life of Jesus"?

3. "Jesus did not come to preach the Gospel. He came that there might be a Gospel to preach."

(a) Is this true?

(b) If true, what is the Gospel?

4. "The Eucharist binds men together after the divine pattern of social life." How does this "divine pattern" differ from actual and proposed patterns of social life today?

5. What part of our Lord's activity for us has He accomplished once for all and what part waits for fulfilment or evolution in the future?

These three books are specially recommended for further study: L. S. Thornton, *The Incarnate Lord*. A. G. Hebert, *Liturgy and Society*. R. C. Moberly, *Atonement and Personality*.

THE CHURCHES FEEL THEIR WAY

By SHERMAN ELBRIDGE JOHNSON, Nashotah House

The Oxford Conference (Official Report). Ed. by J. H. Oldham. Chicago: Willett, Clark, 1937, pp. xviii + 290. \$2.00.

A review of the Oxford reports must of necessity be a review of the Oxford conference, and—for one who was present and in sympathy with its work—a defense of its aims. The Episcopal Church has perhaps been more interested in the Faith and Order movement than in Life and Work. In this respect we differ from the Orthodox, who found coöperation more easy at Oxford than at Edinburgh. Since the conference, criticism has not been lacking. Were its labors worth while? Can the churches act on its pronouncements, and if so, are they worth acting on? The impression is widespread that the tone of the conference was altogether liberal Protestant, with a strong flavor of parlor socialism. The best refutation of this notion is found by reading the documents of the conference. True, they are lengthy; but they form a mere pamphlet for those who can read *Anthony Adverse* or *Seven Pillars of Wisdom*. The crying need is for people to read these official reports and let them search their consciences.

Except for two groups, Christians would in general approve of the calling of such a conference. The exceptions are those who believe that no church conference of any sort ought to be undertaken until the Roman See extends its blessing by sending official delegates; and those who believe that church meetings should confine themselves to "spiritual" and doctrinal matters. Most of these have condemned the conference in sweeping terms. That is not to say that many matters in the report will not bear criticism; but such criticism, which will be attempted in this article, serves only to make the very real achievement of the conference stand out.

The reports are not unified declarations or decisions, as Dr Leiper points out in his preface to the American edition; they are simply statements of very widely held and important opinions. They represent the thought largely of middle class people, and too few laymen participated. Yet it is difficult to see how large masses of Christian farmers and workers can at present make their views articulate. Perhaps, despite this, and despite the presence of coöpted delegates (to which some churches objected), Oxford was as good an expression of non-Roman Christian social thought as could be achieved. The conference had sufficient material to keep it busy for several months, not two weeks; and it did the best possible job under the circumstances. The worship was a thrilling experience for most of the members. Dr Oldham courteously notes (p. 11) that it did not completely satisfy the Orthodox and Anglo-Catholics; to tell the truth, it also seemed too formal to some of the American Protestants: so perhaps it made everyone slightly uncomfortable, which was a good thing. Certainly the theology expressed in the worship was prevailingly conservative.

The chief objection to the report which members of the historic churches are likely to make refers to the concept of the Church which underlies the reports. In several places the report makes it clear that what it says about "the church" or "the churches" does not refer to *Una Sancta*. But for Catholics, *the Church* has a very definite relation to some visible church or churches, and the use of the term *Una Sancta* seems dangerously to imply an invisible Church or some other vague, intangible reality. The reports seem to regard the visible Church as the totality of organized Christian groups (see pp. 57, 68, and 114)—or at least those represented at the conference, plus perhaps the Roman Catholics. Quite naturally, the conference does not attempt to state what relation these groups bear to *Una Sancta*. Thus those who agree with the thesis of the book by Fr Puller and Dr. Stone, *Who Are Members of the Church?*, might feel that assent to the

reports would commit them to a view of the Church which they cannot hold.

Despite these objections, however, it is obvious that a higher doctrine of the Church underlies the reports than one might have expected. The Church to which members of the conference give their allegiance is no mere hazy and mystical quantum. It is sent by God into the world to redeem the world, and it makes higher claims on man's allegiance than any human organization can make. We may well be thankful for this resurgence of "high church" doctrine. But, above all, the thing for us to realize is that the reports are intended to give guidance to existing ecclesiastical organizations, not to set forth a doctrine of the Church. There are certain tasks that the "churches" need desperately to perform, whether they are "provinces of the Catholic Church" or "human societies of Christians"! And whether they are one or the other, they are all faced by the same dire threats to their spiritual integrity and existence. The question is, can they arrive at a measure of coöperation in the face of their problems? This reviewer does not profess to know; but the Ecumenical Patriarchate seems to think it possible. In considering the matter, we should simply be realistic. Though we cannot agree as to what *the Church* is, much of what the conference says about *organized Christianity as it exists* is true. If in reading the reports we mentally substitute "organized Christianity" for "the church" or "the churches" we shall find little difficulty. We ought not to let occasionally vague language stand in the way of truth.

The brief "message from the conference" (p. 45) calls for our repentance "both as individuals and as corporate bodies." Many dislike to think of *the Church* as repenting; yet who nowadays would object to the *Church of England* repenting of its totalitarian alliance with Henry VIII and wishing that the great individual advantages then obtained could have been gained in some other way?

The conference has sometimes been accused of being rather violently anti-German and anti-Fascist. Indeed, the most serious weakness of the report is that while much criticism is plainly directed against Fascism, almost nothing is said, e.g., about persecution of Christians in the U. S. S. R. The conference might well have said more clearly that social democracy (or economic experimentation) apart from the worship of God contains within itself dangers of its own. There is no question that the singling out of the Nazis and silence on the Russian situation has discredited Oxford in the minds of many. It is true that the German free churchmen who defended their home government were given a respectful, though chilly, hearing. The report on Church and Community is mild. Nationality is "essentially a gift of God to mankind." "Any form of national egotism whereby the love of one's own people leads to the suppression of other nationalities or national minorities, or to the failure to respect and appreciate the gifts of other people, is sin and rebellion against God" (pp. 59f). Equally strong language has emanated from papal circles in recent years. When the report says (p. 56) that "human life is falling to pieces because it has tried to organize itself into unity on a secularistic and humanistic basis without any reference to the divine will," we would agree. Humanism has had its growth because since 1500 Christianity has had no united front, and the Church has been only too glad to hand over many of her functions to the State. Nor is the Church fitted to resume those functions immediately; as the report seems to say, its inner life must be deepened before this can be.

The report on Church and State is more incisive. "We do not consider the state as the ultimate source of law but rather as its guarantor. . . . There can be for the Christian no ultimate authority but very God" (p. 67). The duty of Church to State is expressed (pp. 70f) in terms that could hardly be improved upon. The conference seems to assume that the Church has certain rights, and sets forth (p. 72) the conditions essential for performance of her work, and here

it is to be noted that the (Presbyterian) Church of Scotland is in much happier case than the Church of England. It is a matter for satisfaction that on the plea of the Bishop of Southwark the conference adopted the words, "All churches should renounce the use of the coercive power of the state in matters of religion." It ought to be perfectly clear today that in some situation any religious body may find itself a minority group; and that when one minority is not safe, all minorities and thus all churches are potentially in danger. It ought also to be obvious that political power wielded by a church leads normally to inner rottenness. Yet churches continue to hang on to shreds of prerogative; and there is no guarantee that even a "liberal" church might not be a persecutor once it is in the saddle.

Modern man is most sensitive in the region of his pocket-book. Hence it is the report on the Economic Order which will cause the greatest searchings of mind. The conference definitely regards economics as a field for Christian concern, and bases its philosophy on the principle of justice. Undue emphasis on love as something transcending law may "tempt Christians to allow individual acts of charity to become a screen for injustice and a substitute for justice" (p. 78). The activistic, pragmatic element in Christendom speaks here, and yet it must be said that the report disclaims any idea of official and coercive interference on the part of the churches. Apparently it is the conscience of the Christian layman which is to be aroused. The report confines its critique to the capitalist world, apparently on the ground that one cannot really get at the facts in Russia and the fascist countries. This is perhaps wise, but it lays the presentation open to suspicion and criticism.

The Oxford fathers regard capitalism as a step forward in human progress (p. 81). They do not seem to challenge the profit motive as such, but declare that it has tended to "deprive the worker of the social meaning of his work." (No one yet knows how to solve this problem.) On p. 99 something is

said, quite rightly, about the rights of the worker, but it should have been added that the employer is normally entitled to an honest and willing day's work. Along with the report one should notice the statement in the conference's message (p. 48) that "the existence of economic classes presents a barrier to human fellowship which cannot be tolerated by the Christian conscience." If it were meant that economic inequalities are *ipso facto* evil, we could not accept the idea; but it is a fact that these inequalities have led to a social stratification through which Christian fellowship finds difficulty in penetrating, and the present challenge to Christians is to rediscover fellowship despite these economic accidents. The report (p. 93) frankly recognizes differences in economic philosophy and does not plump for any partisan view; in this it is truly Christian. There is much sound common sense in the concluding section on "Immediate Christian Action," and under this heading the conference suggests that the churches begin with their own institutional life (p. 108). No great rush to jump on this bandwagon has yet begun; yet the world can hardly be expected to listen to the economic preachments of the churches until we show that we mean business by revising our methods of collecting and spending.

The reports seem tacitly to assume that Christianity is most at home in a liberal democracy, and this reviewer would agree. Yet there are many who would say, with equal truth, that Christianity could conceivably do its work in an imperialistic autocracy of the old-fashioned sort, or in a modern totalitarian state. (Read, for example, Rom. 13, I Pet. 2-4, and the second century apologists.) It may be thought that the conference spoke out too blatantly for the Church's rights, whereas the only right the Church has is to maintain her moral integrity in the face of a non-Christian world. All of this may be so; but part of the conference's duty was to answer the question, what is God's will for those churches which *do* exist in democratic countries, where rights are guaranteed? Finally, it must be said that the burden of

proof is on those who would suggest that there is some better atmosphere for Christian growth than democracy.¹

When one reads the report on Education, one sees clearly that it is in this area of life that the Church now finds the most serious challenge to her life. Many school teachers are quite sure that a purely secular education will give mankind all that is needed (p. 122); education now aims at producing a particular kind of person in accordance with secularist aims (p. 123); Christian faith is regarded as a divisive element in the community (p. 126), and this has come about because Christians cannot agree on the fundamentals of Christian faith and life (p. 129). This reviewer remembers vividly a discussion group for "associates" held in one of the Oxford colleges under the chairmanship of Principal McElheran of Toronto, at which education was discussed. The Americans were pathetically conscious of the failure of their religious education, and eager to learn from the English, who have been more successful. The story was always the same: the schools are now reaching into the leisure time of children, in which the Church once had a place, while our Sunday Schools and week-day programs have not educated, despite the eternal tinkering of experts.

At one point (p. 131) the report on education calls for a "living" theology of God and man as if it were something new; what is needed is really a better understanding of a very old theology, as Reinhold Niebuhr could tell us. Kindly words are said about Christian associations in the colleges (p. 135) and denominational schools (p. 139). Yet on some campuses the associations become secular in tone, and the staffs of denominational schools do not always follow Christian aims.

¹ Perhaps we may be permitted an *obiter dictum*: the Church does her work much better in those autocratic states like ancient Rome where the state is inimical to the Church, than in despotisms which are nominally Christian. But it is one thing for the Church to have to fight a dying and divided foe, like ancient paganism; another thing to face a unified and entrenched state religion, like Islam (in some periods of history) or communism.

The most sensible thing said is that the Church needs to obtain at least partial control of the teacher-training system, as she has done in England (p. 133); until this is done we need not expect a Christian educational system to develop. The coöperative plan for religious education which has proved so successful in Yorkshire is mentioned, though not by name (p. 141); it will certainly repay study by all who wish religion to be taught in the schools.

The report on "the Universal Church and the World of Nations" is frankly internationalist, as might be expected; see especially p. 157, where it is said that national states should abandon the claim to be judge in their own causes. Many Christians would not yet be ready to go this far, and almost insuperable practical difficulties stand in the way of fulfilment of the ideal; yet the principle itself is difficult to refute. What is said about the League of Nations (pp. 159f) is sturdy common sense. The most constructive material in the report is an outline of the churches' duties in the present situation (pp. 167ff); only a truly ecumenical Church, with allegiances which transcend national boundaries, can show the way to unity for a divided world. The conference recognizes that Christians hold three main attitudes toward military service in time of war, and refuses to condemn any one of them as un-Christian (pp. 162ff).

In the findings of the Oxford conference there may be many points to criticize, and no one has yet suggested that the reports partake of the nature of dogma. But the work of Oxford needs desperately to be carried on because we face the dogma that some one race, nation or class has a divine claim to be dominant over all others; because in the average man's loyalties the Christian religion is no longer central but peripheral; because religious persecution still takes place and minorities are not safe; economic distinctions tend to divide Christians into castes, and even the Church's own economic life is not above reproach; the State, even in democratic countries, continues to encroach upon the domain of

the Church, particularly in the field of education;² and the Christian churches are at present so nationally oriented that they do not effectively promote international coöperation. Perhaps these problems can be solved by the existing confessional groups, without a united front or coöperative action; but the experience of the past makes this a rather forlorn hope.

² Not to mention worship. Despite the able speech made at the conference by the Rev. Chukichi Yasuda of Kyoto, the reverence for shrines demanded by the Japanese government is *probably* idolatrous.

VARRONIAN KOINE

By CHARLES MARSTON LEE, Geneva College

Since the time when discoveries of papyri established the fact that koine is the dialect of the New Testament, few or no studies have been published that deal merely with Varro's use of koine in his *Menippean Satires*, or with the relationship of this part of his vocabulary to that of the New Testament. Hence it may not be amiss to indicate a few similarities between Varro's Hellenistic words and some words of the New Testament.

Augustine noticed that there was some agreement between Varro and the Scriptures, for he writes in the *De Civitate Dei* XVIII: 40, ". . . Varro, qui hoc prodidit, quod a litterarum etiam divinarum veritate non dissonat."

Marcus Terentius Varro (116-27 B.C.) used Hellenistic Greek even though this fact is not included in Sophocles' *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (1900) in the Introduction on page 12 where it should have been noted. Although his *Menippean Satires*¹ is a Latin work, he uses 230 Greek words, mostly in phrases, in the extant fragments. Over 34 per cent. of Varro's Menippean Greek words are found in exactly the same form in the New Testament. Over 53 per cent. of these words are found in either the same form or some closely related form. Over 80 per cent. of them have corresponding words in the New Testament that are etymologically related to them in whole or in part.

A few of these parallel usages in the two word lists may be of assistance to New Testament scholars.

διαθηκῶν is found in the subtitle of the *Menippean Satire*, "Testamentum περὶ διαθηκῶν," fragment 540 title. This is

¹ *Varronis Menippearum Reliquiae*, in *Petronius Saturae*, Buecheler-Heraeus, 6th ed., Berlin, 1922.

interesting because the *Century Dictionary*, under 'testament' considers that 'testamentum' is an "incorrect translation, first in Tertullian, of Gr. διαθήκη, 'a covenant' (applied in this sense to the two divisions of the Bible)."

ἐπαρχιών in the subtitle of the *Menippean Satires* frag. 175 has to do with 'provinces' as also does ἐπαρχείας in Acts 23: 34. Varro's spelling with chi iota instead of chi epsilon iota is the later one. Thus it seems that Luke is more Hellenic than Hellenistic here in dialect. Beside Varro Greek inscriptions of the second and first centuries B.C. had also used the koine spelling.

ἕως πότε is an idiom meaning 'how long?,' that is frequent in later Greek. It occurs in Varro, *M. S.* 173 title, Matt. 17: 17 twice, Mark 9: 19 twice, Luke 9: 41, John 10: 24, and Rev. 6: 10. Dr Nestle considers ἕως πότε a Hebraism, differing from Moulton who overlooks Varro in his *Grammar of New Testament Greek* (1919) volume I, page 264, in the list where Pseudo-Aristeas, Polybius, Cicero, Dionysius Halicarnassensis, et al. are put. See also page 107 footnote. Jones and McKenzie in their revision of Liddell and Scott add nothing on the question as to whether the idiom occurs in pre-koine times, for they cite only New Testament passages that use ἕως πότε.

λιθόστρωτα, *M. S.* 533, "stone paved," "tesselated," and λιθόστρωτον, John 19: 13, "the Pavement," where Pilate's judgment seat was located, are interesting usages since only one form of the word is found in the New Testament. It occurs elsewhere in Sophocles *Antigone* 1204, Aristeas 11, LXX Paralipomenon 2: 7: 3 (Rahlfs' edition, 1935, vol. I, page 821), Josephus *Bellum Judaicum* 6: 1: 8, and Epictetus 4: 7: 37, according to Sophocles *Greek Lexicon* which omits the Varro citation. Ebert's article in Pauly-Wissowa XIII: 775 on λιθόστρωτον refers to neither Varro nor the New Testament.

λογομαχίας, I Tim. 6: 4, is an unusual word which had also been used by Varro in *M. S.* 242 as a title, Λογομαχία, and in *M. S.* 243, λογομαχίαν. Moulton and Geden mark this word with the dagger as not occurring in pre-Christian writings.

However, the fixing of the text of Nonius Marcellus by Lindsay has progressed far enough to let us consider his quotations from the *Menippean Satires* as being authenticated writings of pre-Christian date; and in spite of Nonius' inaccuracies, we readily believe that *Λογομαχία* was exactly quoted by him, and that *λογομαχίαν* was also exactly quoted by Porphyrio whose later copyists have probably not altered it. Hence the dagger should be struck out of the lemma *λογομαχία* in Moulton and Geden's *Concordance*, page 601.

μηθέν in Varro, *M. S.* 320, throws light on New Testament Greek. It occurs also in Acts 27: 33. But, even though *μηθέν* is found several times, the spelling *μηθέν* only appears once in the New Testament. Thayer's *Lexicon* (1886), cites the usage of *μηθέν* as early as 378 B.C. Hence it can probably not be considered merely a koine word. Jones and McKenzie's *Lexicon* says that thereafter it was frequent in the inscriptions and papyri. Also it was rarely used after New Testament times. Hickie calls *οὐθείς* "later and Macedonian Greek." Moulton's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, volume I (3rd edition, 1919), page 264, omits Varro in the list where the authors formerly mentioned by me are listed. Hence it is no wonder that Moulton in Vol. II, part i, page III, makes the mistake of writing, regarding the spelling *μηθέν*, "for i/B.C. we are in the dark"! Varro's use of *μηθέν* could only have occurred in the first century B.C., and Moulton seems to know nothing about it, or else he is only considering the date of Nonius Marcellus as that of the usage. However, the theta spelling was dying out in Nonius' time. Undoubtedly the *μηθέν* spelling in Acts could be correct even though it is *hapax legomenon* in the New Testament. The importance of the word in Varro is due to his use of it in the proverb, *ἄγαν μηθέν*.

Σκιαμαχία, the title of *M. S.* 506, means 'shadow boxing.' This is comparable to I Cor. 9: 26, although *ἀέρα δέρω* is 'beating the air,' not 'shadows.' Smock's valuable work, *The Greek Element in English Words*, incorrectly assigns *σκιαμαχία* to Plutarch as the first user; Smock II: 277. Varro

instead uses the word first even though Plato used the verb form related to it, *σκιαμαχεῖν* in Apology 18 D.

φιλαργυρίας, of *M. S. 21*, has no corresponding form in the New Testament except the unusual word *φιλαργυρία* in I Tim. 6: 10; but notice also *φιλάργυροι* twice in the New Testament and the negative forms *ἀφιλάργυρον*, I Tim. 3: 3 and *ἀφιλάργυρος*, Heb. 13: 5, which do not occur in pre-Christian writings according to Moulton and Geden. Still, we note, that statement now needs correction because Jones and McKenzie's *Lexicon* (Part 2, 1926) shows on page 290 that *ἀφιλάργυρος* is found twice in times B.C., first in an inscription from Priene (second century B.C.) and second in Diodorus Siculus 9: 11, who was contemporary with Varro. But even thus it is still strictly a koine word.

Further studies might be made of the relationship of Varro's koine to that of the Septuagint, and of the Latinized Greek words that he uses. It is too early to conclude either that Varro was versed in Semitic lore or that the New Testament authors were influenced by Varro directly or indirectly. Their most important and extensive literary borrowings were of course, as the ages have known, from the Old Testament.

However, this article has indicated that there is an hitherto unnoticed, but rather remarkable vocabulary overlap between Varro's Menippean Greek and that of the New Testament.

BOOK REVIEWS

A New Approach to the Old Testament. By C. A. Alington. Harper, 1938, pp. xi + 207. \$1.85.

"The more books like this we can have, the better it will be for everybody," says the Archbishop of York in his introduction to this work by the Dean of Durham. A reading of the book makes the justice of that apparent.

The stories of the Old Testament, says the author, are interesting in themselves—their larger importance comes in seeing them through the eyes of those who emphasised the ethical, legal and spiritual values to be seen in them: the prophets. It is certainly to be questioned whether a Jew would ever so regard the problem. To him the prophets take on importance largely as interpreters of the Torah. To the Christian, on the other hand, there is a constant need for an integration between the Old and the New Testament.

This integrating force, the author would see, as the reviewer interprets this work, very largely in the prophets, or, rather, in the prophetic period as a whole, for a chapter is given over to a discussion of Deuteronomy. Thus, while giving a few chapters to the Early Stories and Early Prophecy, the author is primarily interested in the great eighth century and exilic prophets, with a chapter or two given to the Apocrypha. The reader is by this means urged to read the Old Testament as a whole, through the eyes of those who realized its full implications and enriched its substance through their interpretation.

It is too much to say that this book should serve as an introduction to the Old Testament—it is too brief and selective for that—but it does offer a fresh and suggestive approach. Adequate historical notes maintain the chronological thread of the narrative, and a table of dates in the back makes it possible for the reader to keep the events in their proper order. For those who know Fowler's excellent little work, *Origin and Growth of Hebrew Religion*, it will be enough to say that this newer work offers much the same material with the same deep insight into and devotion to the superb work of the prophets.

ALLEN D. ALBERT, JR.

Das Buch Josua. By Martin Noth. Tübingen: Mohr, 1938, pp. xv + 122 + 2 maps. M. 5.80.

This commentary is No. 7 of the first series of the *Handbuch zum Alten Testament* edited by Prof. Eissfeldt. As is natural in treating the Book of Joshua the author devotes much time to critical analysis. His position is briefly as follows: Difficulties arise preëminently with the inquiry as to the predeuteronomic history of the book. Here two facts seem to be certain: 1. That 13: 1-21: 42 has had its own previous literary history, which has nothing to do with the other parts of the book, nor with that of most of the other portions of the Hexateuch. 2. That in the remaining sections of the Joshua narrative also the material is of a different sort from that of Genesis, for example.

Back of 13: 1-21: 42 lie two documents as principal sources: 1. A system of tribal boundaries, actual and ideal, which comes from the time before the formation of the states. From this Reuben, Simeon and Levi are lacking. 2. A list of the places in the kingdom of Judah after its division into 12 districts, from the time of Josiah. These were combined by a redactor (*Bearbeiter*) to make a complete distribution of the whole land among all the tribes, to which later a narrative of the conquest of the land under Joshua was added.

Chapters 2-11: 9 are made up of isolated local Benjamite etiological legends, having to do with the sanctuary at Gilgal, which later were woven together and transferred from Benjamin to all Israel (2-9); and hero narratives which underlie 10-11: 9, these also being originally local. The author of this combination Noth calls the compiler (*Sammler*). It was he who introduced the figure of Joshua, but he is not responsible for the transfer of the legends and stories to all Israel, for that had already in his day taken place, and a literary work of this sort lay before him, in which the series of events was fixed.

The basis of chapter 24 is a tradition of an assembly at Shechem, with two tomb narratives. This had originally no connection with the legends of 1-12, but was affixed by the compiler to his narrative as a conclusion. (Noth places the work of the compiler at about 900 B.C.) "Here (in c. 24) we have to do (so far as history is concerned) with the extension of the covenant relation established at Sinai to the whole of the twelve tribes, including also those which had not participated in the Sinai covenant; and with the solemn establishment of the sacred (*sakralen*) twelve-tribe union. It is to me probable that in this connection of events the figure of Joshua also has its home, i.e. that in the founding of the twelve-tribe union Joshua actually played a decisive part" (p. 108f).

Having thus analysed the Book of Joshua without reference to the Pentateuch the author proceeds to argue that the earlier material in Joshua cannot with certainty be assigned to either the J or the E source of the Pentateuch.

In his critical method the author displays a fondness for analysis in rather extreme form, and an accompanying disposition to resolve all ancient traditions into isolated units of local origin. He has a special predilection for etiological legends and in tracing these back to their source he is apt to arrive at results which put a severe strain on the reader's credulity (e.g. pp. 4, 21). It is pleasant to add that the author puts forward his conclusions with a modesty quite devoid of dogmatism.

The commentary exhibits wide acquaintance with recent archaeological publications. A valuable feature is its index of places mentioned in Joshua, giving the Hebrew name and, where identification has been established, the modern Arabic name, with the meaning of each, if known.

FLEMING JAMES.

Thirty Psalmists. By Fleming James. Putnam, 1938, pp. xv + 261. \$2.75.

The Bohlen Lectures for 1936 are 'A study in personalities of the Psalter as seen against the background of Gunkel's Type-Study of the Psalms.' The book begins with an outline of Gunkel's theory and an explanation of the method pursued by the lecturer. The thirty psalmists who are studied form ten groups. First come the authors of hymns in general (8, 19, 29, 95, 103, 139, 146), then

'Songs of Zion' (46, 84, 122). Next the author of a Psalm of Yahweh's enthronement (97), and he in turn is followed by authors of laments and psalms of penitence and trust (44, 22, 39, 42-43, 51, 130, 27, 16, 23), of individual thanksgivings (32, 40: 1-11, 116), of wisdom psalms (49, 91, 73), a royal psalm (72), a psalm making use of the ancient stories of Israel (106), and of a psalm liturgy (15). In an appendix at the end is a further explanation of Gunkel's type-study and an essay which provides a good supplement to Gunkel's own essay, 'The Religion of the Psalms,' in his volume, *What Remains of the Old Testament*.

Dr. James follows Gunkel quite closely—but not uncritically. He sometimes distinguishes his own view from the views of other followers of Gunkel, for example Mowinckel; and moreover James is not limited in his knowledge of the Psalms to the great *Commentary* and *Introduction* by Gunkel! He is equally familiar with all the other leading authors and commentators, so that one does not read far in the book before he comes to the conclusion that *Thirty Psalmists* is, like Gunkel's own *Ausgewählte Psalmen*, the final product of many years of careful study and meditation upon the Psalter.

Readers who are interested in the application of the teaching of the Psalter to present day life will find in Dr James' fascinating interpretation of the personalities which stood behind the Psalms many a message with a bearing upon social life today. In fact, everyone who reads the Psalter regularly, and every preacher, will find this book full of illumination and suggestion.

FREDERICK C. GRANT.

The Psalms. Chronologically Treated, with a New Translation. By Moses Buttenwieser. Univ. of Chicago Press, 1938, pp. xviii + 911, including three indexes. \$5.00.

This is a challenging book; partly because a volume of its magnitude, coming from so ripe and profound a scholar as Prof. Buttenwieser, on so vital a subject as the Psalms, must demand attention; partly because of the deeply religious tone and the authentic note of personal religious experience which pervades it; but perhaps most of all because of the bold way in which the author takes issue with prevailing trends in contemporary Psalm criticism.

To illustrate the last point:

1. He arranges the Psalms chronologically, not only dividing them into the broad categories Pre-Exilic, Exilic, Post-Exilic, but finding for many of them a definite historical setting. Ps. 68B is a contemporary record of the victory of Deborah, parallel to Judges 5 (p. 42); Ps. 81B belongs with Josh. 24, both being written on the occasion of Joshua's great religious undertaking (p. 62)—and so on. Only about 35 of the Psalms are listed as of uncertain date. The usual view is that any exact dating of individual psalms is generally impossible.

2. He is very certain as to the authorship of a number of psalms. Ps. 68B and the Song of Deborah come from the same author; Pss. 60A and 57B/60B are the work of David; Deutero-Isaiah composed nine psalms, the author of Job four—and so on. The usual view is that the authors of psalms cannot on the whole be identified.

3. He gives free rein to the tendency which appeared so strikingly in his commentary on Job, of rearranging the Bible text. He divides psalms, changes

the order of verses, omits verses, and inserts verses from other psalms; and the same with parts of verses. The result is often a very different psalm from the one in the Bible. Most scholars, on the contrary, content themselves with few transpositions within a single psalm, and avoid insertions from other psalms; though it must be conceded that some of them emend the text very vigorously. Nor are psalms often divided.

4. He interprets the "I" of many psalms collectively. This is a practice that has been widely given up.

5. In his translation he makes frequent use of the *precative perfect*. The existence of this in Hebrew is usually denied.

6. He interprets the utterances of the psalmists regarding temple worship as figurative, interpreting them of the spiritual presence of God. They are generally taken literally.

These six points might be added to, but enough has been said to show the way in which the author sets himself against prevailing views. In general the book bristles with individual opinions which are at times maintained almost against the world—ancient, mediæval and modern; yet never with the slightest misgiving as to their correctness.

If one takes this book seriously (as it ought to be taken), he will be forced to re-examine the grounds for many of his long-accepted ideas regarding the psalms. It is doubtful, however, if after doing so he will conclude that these ideas must be given up.

Nevertheless he will prize the book for its spiritual insight, its rich learning (covering so much else besides the psalms), its clear translations, its detailed commentary which is often so illuminating. It is a volume for which all students of the psalms will be grateful.

FLEMING JAMES.

The Herods of Judæa. By A. H. M. Jones. Oxford University Press, 1938, pp. xii + 271 + 5 maps. \$3.50.

It is quite unusual for an author to have two major works published in the same year. The present volume follows close upon the author's *Cities of the Eastern Provinces*. The present volume is meant to be popular. There are no footnotes and the narrative runs along consecutively from the founding of the dynasty by Antipater in the first century B.C. to the death of Agrippa II and the great rebellion in the beginning of the second century A.D. Herod the Great and his sons, especially Antipas, and the two Agrippas are carefully drawn figures. The book aims to write secular history, and from a secular point of view (our Lord and John the Baptist have only a few lines each); and the author succeeds in painting the background of the New Testament history in a most vivid way.

He is conservative, and accepts the traditional statement that nearly 50,000 souls came back in the first return from exile in 538 B.C. In this and in other respects the author represents a reversion from the hypercritical historical work of many modern writers. Of course he makes use of Josephus, who is our only considerable source for the period; but he does not try to work so far behind the statements of Josephus that the Jewish historian is made to misrepresent everything.

There is a good account of Herod's finances on pp. 86f. "One of the greatest mysteries of Herod's administration is where he got the vast sums he must have required for his lavish expenditure." His financial administration was apparently modeled upon that of Egypt. There were royal banks in the chief cities. There were public granaries. Much of the revenue of the land was collected in grain—and the tribute to Rome was reckoned in grain. Although there were import and export duties, the main tax was probably upon the land and took the form of a percentage of the crop, as did the Roman tribute fixed by Caesar. In addition there was a sales tax which was an innovation on the part of Herod—the author thinks of it not as a market tax but as something like a stamp tax on contracts of sale.

The 'Herodians' are explained (p. 179) as comprising "not merely the official aristocracy which the dynasty had created and which was dependent on its favour, but many Jews of standing. It was definitely pro-Roman—the test question on the tribute put by its members to Jesus proves this—but it apparently preferred the indirect rule of Rome through its loyal agents, the Herodian dynasty." The statement is quite probable, though the test question on the tribute does not necessarily prove that the Herodians were pro-Roman.

The reconstruction of the chronology for the year 40 and following (pp. 198ff) is quite satisfactory and helps us to see the sequence of events much more clearly. Though the author does not consider the question, it also helps us to date more definitely the Little Apocalypse in Mark 13 ('The Abomination of Desolation') in the summer of the year 40.

The author views the great rebellion of 66-70 as the result more of religious unrest than of political or economic conditions—though he recognizes that economic factors were involved (p. 223). The main factor was undoubtedly religious nationalism—"The Romans were hated simply as gentiles whose rule over the people of God was a sacrilege." Perhaps it was the untoward economic circumstances which gave a cutting edge to the religious unrest. "After Agrippa's reign, and partly perhaps as a result of his extravagant and incompetent rule, there seems to have been a decline in prosperity. Times were bad, as the enormous increase in brigandage, always a sure index of the welfare of Palestine, clearly shows, and there were several severe famines. Taxation bore heavily on the poorer classes, and the peasants were falling into the hands of money-lenders and being squeezed out of their holdings; it is significant that one of the first actions of the revolutionaries in the final revolt was to burn down the record office, where the mortgage-deeds were filed" (p. 223).

The book is an excellent piece of historical writing and ought to be familiar to every student of the New Testament. It is illustrated with eight fine reproductions of photographs which are annotated in the preface.

FREDERICK C. GRANT.

The Validity of the Gospel Record. By Ernest Findlay Scott. Scribner, 1938, pp. vii + 213. \$2.00.

At last Professor Scott has written a book on Form Criticism! And is Scott also among the Form critics? Yes—but moderately. But make no mistake: the book is on something more than a method of criticism. It deals with the

whole question and problem, emerging from modern literary and historical research in the field of early Christianity, viz. the validity of the Gospel record. It is a wise and mellow book, the ripe fruit of many years of study and reflection, of teaching and meditation. Its very method is that of a great teacher—closely reasoned, and clear, and pedagogically sound: for Dr Scott does not hesitate, from any fear of possible criticism of his style, to repeat, when repetition will make sure the student does not overlook some connection he might otherwise miss. From his very method there is something to learn. True, he carries the British method of presenting both sides to such an extreme of sympathetic interpretation that the reader may sometimes wonder why both opposed points of view may not be true! But the distinction is finally drawn, and clearly—often with brilliant use of analogy or illustration. The result is a book to commend unreservedly to students, and to everyone interested in its great subject. If we had some National Academy given to crowning works of distinguished merit, this volume certainly should be nominated. As it is, the Religious Book Club has done all but that, in making it one of its selections.

The first two chapters deal with the Gospels as history, and the history and the message: wherein the sound view is set forth that the Gospels were "not works of a new character, based, to some extent, on the primitive reminiscences. They contain the primitive record itself, as it had been preserved and transmitted by a succession of teachers" (p. 4). This record, viz. the 'history,' is not merely the later substantiation of the message: from the outset, the history *was* the message. This means that the Gospel tradition belonged not to one or two or a dozen individuals, but was the property of the whole movement, the whole Church. And the Gospels were not literary products, i.e. the precious writings of four individual men, but grew out of the tradition that lay behind them, first in stereotyped forms of the tradition, then written sources (or compilations), finally Gospels. They have no abstruse doctrinal purpose, but intend primarily and chiefly to record the testimony of those who had borne witness before (cf. p. 33, on Mark).

Chapters iii and iv deal with the tradition in church worship, and the tradition and the community. The Gospels grew; but they did not grow automatically or of their own accord. The "meeting for worship was the most powerful single factor in the moulding of Christian ideas, institutions, and literature, and against this background the history of the Gospel tradition has to be understood" (p. 66). Hence—as against the extremer Form critics—"Is it conceivable that memories of Jesus were not preserved for their own sake, but only survived because they happened to be used now and then by preachers as illustrations?" (p. 69). Still, if the history *was* the message, as Scott maintains (and we agree), would not precisely this use account for the *form* they took, rather than their preservation? And that is all we understand Dibelius to imply—though other critics go further, and at least suggest that the early tradition was creative, not simply transmissive. With Scott we agree that communities do not create tradition, any more than committees do—but they formulate, expand, and sometimes alter it. Yet "behind this message which came to light in the first century and produced the Christian church, there must have been some extraordinary event in man's outward or spiritual life: that is now admitted by all. And the one event which

will explain everything is the emergence of a great personality, such as is described in the Gospels. The church and the message both arose out of that historical life which had preceded them" (p. 96).

It is in the final chapters, on the oral tradition, the meaning of form, and the beginning of the tradition, that the author comes to grips with Form Criticism. With ninety per cent. of what Scott says, we believe Dibelius himself would be in agreement—though he insists that the 'forms' of the tradition were 'artificial' (p. 121). This implies that there was a time, or a period, when the church consciously and deliberately set about 'fixing' the tradition definitely, as a safeguard against the free manipulations of fancy or devotion; and this looks more in the direction of Bultmann than of Dibelius, perhaps. For such conscious, deliberate, explicit formulation could only be the work of a group—not the individual preachers, but the *teachers* of the church, working in concert and handing down their work as oriental teachers were wont to do.

But perhaps it is not a question of 'either—or.' Instead, we should like to propose the view that *both* methods were at work, successively, and to some extent simultaneously (i.e. they overlapped). The 'early stories,' as Dibelius calls them, and the parables, and the sayings—surely these are too 'popular' in form to be the product of deliberate formulation! Their analogies, near or remote, in rabbinic tradition, in folk-lore generally, in primitive 'oral literature' (see Chadwick's *Growth of Literature*), are all on the side of a natural, unconscious formulation—or preservation of their original form as first reported or narrated. But on the other hand, the exquisite, artistically arranged *literary* products (oral or written) that we find in 'M,' for example—wrought like chased gold and polished as jewels: the Temptation Narrative (surely in its original order in Matthew, though derived from 'Q'), the Allegory of the Last Judgment in ch. 25, the structurally arranged sections of the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew: behind these lay the work of perhaps successive generations of teachers, whose work was deliberate—and pedagogical. At least, it seems to us that there are elements of truth in both views, the natural or social evolution of the 'form' of the tradition, and its deliberate, quasi-literary formulation.

As with everything Professor Scott writes, a positive religious interest informs the whole book. Here is a theologian and exegete and historical interpreter for whom theology is not divorced from history, nor either history or theology from religion.

FREDERICK C. GRANT.

The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man. By Rudolph Otto. Tr. by Floyd V. Filson and Bertram Lee Woolf. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1938, pp. 406. \$3.50.

Rudolf (not -ph) Otto's great work on 'The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man' is at last available in English. Professor Filson's translation is readable, clear and reliable. It had the advantage of revision by Professor Otto shortly before his lamented death early last year. Rudolph Otto's book has already had great influence upon English theology. Professor Dodd, for example, has applied Otto's major idea in his work on the Parables. Briefly, the idea is that according to our Lord the Kingdom was not only coming but had already arrived.

The difficulty with the theory is that if the Kingdom is already here, how then is there any room left for a Final Judgment? This difficulty is variously explained. And it does seem likely that Jesus' conception of the Kingdom is not wholly futuristic. At any rate the Kingdom was *so* near at hand that like a solar transit it had already begun to be present. The world had already begun moving into the area of divine illumination and blessing. The 'powers of the age to come' were already manifest. The 'strong man' was already being bound and his minions were already in flight, his victims already being released. True, the full presence of the Kingdom had not yet come to pass. The heavenly throne had not appeared. There was still opposition, but opposition was doomed to melt away.

We believe that there is a great deal of truth in this contention—whatever must be made of the difficulty about the Last Judgment. But this is only part of our difficulty with Otto's theory. Our major difficulty lies in the fact that, like Schweitzer, he has not paid enough attention to Synoptic criticism, and apparently does not hesitate to use material from Matthew as if it were on a par with Mark. There is no hint apparently that the peculiar material in Matthew may not be equally as historical as Q. That is the first difficulty, and goes back of course to the fact that Professor Otto was primarily an authority in the history of religions rather than in the field of New Testament. Our second difficulty with Otto's theory is that he seems to place altogether too much reliance upon the apocalyptic elements in the Gospel. After all, there are only a dozen or fifteen passages in Mark which are out-and-out apocalyptic—and these include obvious editorial additions, as well as the famous Little Apocalypse in Chapter 13. Moreover, even in Q there are only five or six such passages, and not more than two or three in L. 'Thoroughgoing eschatology' has altered these proportions in making apocalyptic the clue for the interpretation of the whole Gospel.

Still another difficulty is Otto's theory of a primitive Gospel source which underlies like a *Grundschrift* all three Synoptics—a theory which seems to go back to Professor Spitta and is more characteristic of the nineties than of the nineteen-thirties.

FREDERICK C. GRANT.

Theologie des Neuen Testaments. By Paul Feine. 7th ed. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1936, pp. xvi + 456. M. 12.50.

This is a new edition of Feine's *Theology of the New Testament* only in the sense in which in this country we would refer to it as a new issue. It is an unaltered reimpression of the sixth edition—as the sixth (published in 1934) was a reprint of the fifth (published in 1931), with only a few slight changes.

As is true of Feine's *Introduction*, the present work is from the moderate conservative point of view. To many readers it will seem like a voice out of the past. It occupies a kind of half-way position between the critical works of B. Weiss and Beyschlag, and present-day New Testament scholarship. Some would no doubt say that it is farther on the side of Weiss and Beyschlag than it is of present day scholarship. Of course the old-fashioned New Testament theology was not only made possible but was in fact necessitated by absence of

thorough source and tradition criticism. We must not hold these elder scholars responsible for failing to anticipate, say by ten to thirty years, the findings of present-day research. 'There were giants in those days' and with the views then prevailing in the areas of literary and textual criticism, they produced works of amazing erudition and penetration. Feine's book belongs in that class.

For the present-day student it will be necessary to add queries and criticisms on the margin of almost every page; but for all that, there are many excellent suggestions to be gained and many fresh insights to be attained under Feine's leadership. Naturally some parts of the book require much less modification before the present-day student can accept them than some other parts. The presentation of the teaching of Jesus, for example, requires a great deal more modification in the light of Form Criticism than does, for example, the account of the teaching of Paul—or even the theological views of the primitive community (Part ii). Moreover the reader will not go far before it occurs to him that some of the material in Part i, which deals with the teaching of Jesus, while it cannot be assigned to the historical Jesus himself, does, nevertheless, set forth the theology of the primitive Church, that is, of the primitive Palestinian community. In brief, much in the Theology of Jesus' teaching now belongs in the Theology of the Primitive Church. Indeed, this is one of the positive contributions which Form Criticism has to make toward the understanding of the New Testament. Instead of our having to discard elements in the teaching of our Lord, as represented in the Gospels, and say, "This is later accretion, this is legend, this is unhistorical," we now say, "This is the way Jesus was viewed by the primitive community of his followers, somewhere along the way from ten to perhaps sixty years after his ministry had closed." In fact there is *nothing* in the New Testament that deserves to be snipped off and tossed into the waste basket. Every section, every phrase, every variant reading of every manuscript has something to tell us.

Read in this way and from this approach, Feine's book is worthy the careful attention of even the most advanced Form critic and we must be grateful to the publishers and the present editor (E. Stauffer, who has been in charge since Dr Feine's death) for making this vast compendium once more available.

FREDERICK C. GRANT.

St Peter. By Francis Underhill. Longmans, Green, 1938, pp. viii + 248. \$2.50.

The Bishop of Bath and Wells has given us an interesting, readable and—in its main outlines—faithful account of the life of the fisherman saint, Simon Peter. The material is well-apportioned, including such chapter headings as 'Peter's Home-Land,' 'The Call of Peter,' 'The Special Training of Peter,' 'Peter in the Early Church,' 'The Letters of St Peter,' 'St Peter in Rome,' 'The Martyrdom of St Peter.' There is also a chapter on the apocryphal literature that grew up around the name of Peter. One reads this last with a sigh of thanksgiving for the divine wisdom which prevented such tales from finding a place in the Canon of Sacred Scripture.

Critically the book may be classed as tending somewhat in a conservative direction, though the author is familiar with and mentions the more radical

theories which he himself rejects. Peter is characterized as 'impetuous, free of speech, impulsive, . . . human, generous and large-hearted' (p. 24); he is 'an ordinary type of a man of his time, nation and trade' (p. 28). His position among the other Apostles is that of *primus inter pares*. As regards the famous Petrine passage of Matt. 16, the arguments both for and against its authenticity as a saying of our Lord are set forth side by side, so that the reader may take his choice. A life-long break between St Peter and St Paul, arising from the question of Gentile observance of the law of Moses, is definitely rejected. I Peter is obviously regarded as emanating from the Apostle himself, though the author admits that many reputable scholars think otherwise (II Peter, however, is considered spurious). That St Peter lived, labored and suffered martyrdom in Rome is held to be as certain as any fact of history, as is also the tradition according to which his mortal remains still lie under the dome of the modern St Peter's.

It will at once be seen that these, for the most part, are questions over which the keenest controversy has raged. And indeed throughout the book there are many details with which the majority of scholars, perhaps, would take issue. The Sermon on the Mount (Plain) is regarded as an actual discourse, delivered on a particular occasion (p. 49); in the opinion of the reviewer the author is on the wrong track with regard to the speaking 'with other tongues' (*ἑτέροις γλώσσαις*) of Acts 2:4. Surely Luke, at any rate, intended this to refer to speaking in foreign languages. There is a mis-print on p. 163 ("he" should read "be," line 3), and a more serious one on line 4 of p. 125, where the words 'thou shalt stretch forth thy hands and' belong between the words 'old' and 'another'; only so is there any point to the words 'Now this He spake, signifying by what manner of death he should glorify God.' At the top of p. 85 it is stated that all the synoptists agree that at the Transfiguration Peter 'did not know what he was talking about.' This is incorrect: Matthew does not say so. There is too facile an assumption that the Fourth Gospel is a trustworthy guide where actual history and the *ipsissima verba* of our Lord are concerned; while on two occasions there is what seems to be an arbitrary and unwarranted conflation of three or more sources. For example, in describing Peter's denial of his Master, the author gives a couple of details from Luke's account, then 'jumps' to Matthew, returns to Luke, proceeds to give one or two details from John, and finally ends up with Mark. This may add color and variety to the description, but it certainly is not scientific. It reminds us of the 'scissors and paste' method of the compiler of the Flood Story. It would have been better, in the present writer's opinion, if the author had decided on the primitive tradition (let us say Mark), and then had gone on to say that Luke adds such and such a touch, Matthew such and such, and so on. An interesting connection is pointed out between the *Quo Vadis* story and John 13:36 (where the Vulgate renders the Greek of 'Lord, whither goest thou' by *Domine, quo vadis*).

The criticisms noted above have to do mostly with minor details which do not detract from the value of the portrait as a whole. The book is an ideal one—'popular' in the best sense of the word—for the clergy to recommend to their congregations for Lenten reading and for use at Quiet Days. In providing for

this need, the Bishop of Bath and Wells has rendered the Church a real service—and that in spite of the immense difficulty of the task.

FRANCIS C. LIGHTBOURN.

The Story of Instruction. The Church, the Renaissances, and the Reformations. By Ernest Carroll Moore. Macmillan, 1938, pp. ix + 575. \$4.00.

Dr Moore, father of the University of California at Los Angeles, has undertaken the formidable task of writing the history, not so much of educational processes, as of the changing homes and environments in which education has flourished and of the culture which has conditioned the processes—above all, in terms of creative personalities in education. Such an undertaking is obviously much more difficult than the history of instructional processes, and one that will appeal to a much wider range of readers. The second volume deals with an impressive theme—the Church conceived of as the preceptress of European peoples for more than a thousand years from the rise of monasticism to the Reformation. A wealth of material, well chosen, well proportioned, and clearly presented, is organized mainly about a few great representative figures—Charlemagne and his court scholars, Abelard, Petrarch, Luther, Loyola. Particularly commendable is a chapter on Arab learning, that medium through which so much of the wisdom of Hellas passed to the Latin Church in medieval times.

It is hardly surprising that a busy administrator should not always have used the best authorities, or that he should have made an occasional slip in a work which by its very range demands almost a cross-section of omniscience. But one wonders why Grosseteste and Occam, Colet and Thomas More are nowhere mentioned, and why Calvin is referred to only incidentally.

If the book presents little that is original or profound, it does tell the story of Christendom's intellectual life with imagination and relevance. More than this the author would hardly claim.

P. V. NORWOOD.

The Theory of Religious Liberty in England 1603-39. By T. Lyon. Cambridge University Press; New York: Macmillan, 1937, pp. ix + 242. \$2.25.

This able book won its author the Thirlwall Prize for 1937. It analyzes with admirable objectivity the various strands of thought that went into the idea of religious liberty in England during the creative first third of the seventeenth century. The views of all the more important religious parties have been included.

The author points out that tolerationists are of two sorts. They belong either to a persecuted sect whose belief in toleration is forced upon them by circumstance, or to the more genial company of those whose tolerance grows out of their own belief in reason.

It was under the repressive hand of Archbishop Laud and his immediate predecessors, who made the critical error of identifying church unity with uniformity, that protagonists of toleration of the former kind came into being. Not all of the dissenting groups thought their way through to the principle of tolerance. The political Puritans and Presbyterians seem to have contributed little to the idea during the period in question. The contribution of the Roman Catholics was also negligible. The Congregational-Independents under John

Robinson, however, made a real start in the direction of liberalism by developing the idea of the qualitative difference between the bond which united a citizen to his state and that which united a Christian to his church. It remained for the Arminian Baptists to carry this conception to its logical conclusion, to point out that the authority of the state could not avail to make or break the relation of the Christian to his church, and, in John Smyth, to make the first direct plea for full toleration in England's history.

The second, more urbane type of tolerationist, the type with which the author finds himself quite in sympathy, was represented in distinguished fashion by John Hales of Eton and William Chillingworth among the divines, and among lay writers by Francis Bacon, Robert Burton, John Selden, Sir Thomas Browne, and Lord Herbert of Cherbury. The views of these men are set forth in the book in clear outline.

The author would not insist, I trust, that the two kinds of toleration he describes confront each other in an either-or relationship. The fact would seem to be that each is incomplete without the other. Sectarianism has an undeniable moral drive but is likely to become intellectually narrow. Though it makes for toleration only incidentally, it is likely to acquire a belief in it which is sternly persistent. Latitudinarianism, on the other hand, with all its intellectual breadth, is in danger of becoming morally flaccid. Toleration is of its essence, but that essence is not always durable in the heat of practical exigency. Most communions since the period reviewed by the book have oscillated between the two extremes. What is needed, and never more than today, in face of the menace of totalitarianism, is a toleration characterized at once by hospitality to the ideas of others and an invincible unwillingness to yield up its belief in itself.

DOUGLAS HORTON.

Some Political and Social Ideas of English Dissent, 1763-1800. By Anthony Lincoln. Cambridge University Press, 1938, pp. 292. American price (Macmillan) \$2.50.

Tolerated, yet suffering under political disabilities and social discrimination; suspected as revolutionists, King-killers and sectaries; the eighteenth century dissenters are hardly to be blamed if, as Southey put it, they felt New England to be "more the country of their hearts than the England wherein they were born." Smarting under a sense of injustice, as men deprived of that liberty which was their birthright as Englishmen, the "dissenting interest" could do no otherwise than develop a political and social philosophy based upon the rights of conscience, the natural rights of man, and the inalienable rights of civic equality. Of course they were friends of the French and American revolutions. In his Prince Consort Prize essay Mr Lincoln traces the emergence of this philosophy, with particular attention to two of its exemplars—Richard Price and Joseph Priestley.

There is an excellent account of the remarkable dissenting academies (necessary because the Universities were closed to nonconformists). Mr Lincoln claims for them that they "gave the best and most practical instruction . . . to be found in Britain outside of Scotland." Their contacts with continental thought delivered them from that insularity from which contemporary Anglicanism

suffered, with the result that, in the author's piquant phrase, "much which was neglected at Cambridge, and which never reached Oxford, had a sympathetic reception in the dissenting academies." In this "much" would of course be included Unitarianism, as Miss Griffiths has recently reminded us.

P. V. NORWOOD.

The Charity School Movement. By M. G. Jones. Cambridge University Press (New York: Macmillan), 1938, pp. xiii + 446 + 8 pl. \$7.00.

Miss Jones, Fellow of Girton College, Cambridge, and a lecturer in history in the University, suggests as a subtitle for her work, "A Study of Eighteenth Century Puritanism in Action." She hastens to add that puritanism is used in the sense Troeltsch suggests, as the expression of an austere and devout religious temper apart from any particular dogmatic implications. This spirit dominated the eighteenth century social life in England to a degree little realized until one undertakes to trace the development of such a movement as the free education of the poor of this period. The volume is an outgrowth of the most detailed research and represents a contribution to a much neglected aspect of social history. It bids fair to be standard since it is the only comprehensive study, yet to appear, of the remarkable story of this unique philanthropy of the eighteenth century.

The development of the Charity School Movement is traced through its growth in England but full treatment is given also to its career in Scotland, Ireland and Wales, where local conditions modified some of its emphases.

The eighteenth century, it is pointed out, is noteworthy not only as the age of reason in the field of philosophy, Whig ascendancy in the field of politics, and the industrial revolution in the field of economics, but also as the age of benevolence, par excellence. In an age so remarkable for its philanthropy toward the mission fields at home and abroad, the distress of religious refugees, the misery of negro slaves, the ravages of poverty, and the brutalities of criminal law and prisons, the charity schools founded for the religious education of the poor were the favorite form of benevolence of the period. Singularly the movement has won but scant attention from the historians. The men and women who struggled for the enlightenment of the poor against the obscurantism and indifference of their day, with the exception of Robert Raikes, have received little mention and practically no commendation.

The Charity School movement was instituted primarily to reclaim the children of the poor from the viciousness of the age and the godless environment of a society which worked children and adults alike from sunup to sunset and offered no chance for education in either religion or citizenship. At its height it provided free instruction for hundreds of thousands of children in England alone, entirely at the expense of the religiously minded both in the established Church and in non-conformity. Education of any other type was denied the poor. Along with other motives it should be mentioned that, in the beginning, fear of popery had a large part to play in the loosening of the purse strings of the puritan elements of the population. The curriculum of the schools was mostly concerned with the Bible, catechism, and the three R's, supplemented at times by occupational guidance.

The identification of the S.P.C.K. with the movement, it is pointed out, during the first years of the Society's existence, is generally overlooked. In fact practically all of the efforts of the S.P.C.K. were at first directed to promoting and coordinating the rapid growth of the schools. It was only when the injection of Whig and Tory, high church and low church politics into the movement made the direction of the schools too hot to handle that the society turned its attention to the mission fields almost exclusively. Another result of the Tory offensive and the capture of some of the schools for "High Church and Ormonde" was the withdrawal of non-conformist support and the establishment of its own schools.

Two major results can be traced to the Charity Schools, Miss Jones concludes. The first was the birth of the Sunday School. Robert Raikes found in the schools and their methods his inspiration for gathering into the single day Sunday Schools the children of the poor, who were engaged the other six days of the week in factory and field. The movement caught on because in curriculum, methods, and popularity the ground had been adequately prepared. The second result was in giving the impetus to free education which was really the birth of the modern state system of elementary education. The grammar schools of the time were not the free institutions history has made them out to be. It was the charity school which supplied an interim organization for semi-popular education until the state was ready to take up its duty in the nineteenth century.

The book is a valuable reference work both for the wealth of charity school material and for the intelligence of its findings in a field of social, religious, and educational interest which has long escaped the emphasis it deserves.

HENRY H. SHIRES.

Pope Pius The Eleventh. By Philip Hughes. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1938, pp. x + 318. \$3.00.

Of the several Roman books on Pius XI which have appeared since Teeling's very frank *The Pope in Politics* this one by Fr. Hughes is probably the ablest. But the task of presenting a really convincing apology for all details of the papal policy is a difficult one. The attempt to justify the actions of the Holy See in the Abyssinian conflict will succeed only in the case of the already persuaded papalist. Fr. Hughes, who can write very clearly when he wishes, is vague in this chapter. Apparently his argument is this: Italy claimed that the war was a defensive war on her part. Since Abyssinia did not formally present to the Pope the arguments against this claim he could not decide the question, and so could only issue general, theological instructions (which could have been found in any text-book) on the subject of defensive wars. The moral guidance to be hoped for from the Infallible Voice is clearly of a very limited sort.

A protest is made against the lack of documentary proof for the assertions made in Teeling's book. Fr. Hughes' own habit of making the rhetorical question do duty for argument is almost equally irritating. The book contains much that is interesting and valuable, e.g. the account of Mgr. Ratti's labors in Poland after the War, the analysis of the Concordats of the Pontificate. But the history is of the familiar Roman stamp with Communism as the chief villain, assisted

by Masonry, the Roman Pontiff as the hero, with Fascism generally on the side of the angels.

We learn with interest that, however vague may have been the pronouncements on the moral questions involved in the Abyssinian war, very definite instructions have been sent forth about the Cinema.

W. F. WHITMAN.

Doctrine in the Church of England. The Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine Appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1922. Macmillan, 1938, pp. v + 242. \$1.75.

This volume, regarded in England as "the most important doctrinal Statement since the Reformation," should certainly be read by all priests of our Church. It has already caused much discussion. It must be remembered that the Report is in no sense an official statement, except insofar as it has been endorsed by the English Convocations. Nor is it intended to be a treatise on Systematic Theology. The avowed purpose, faithfully adhered to, is merely to survey and consider various points of view and differences of opinion actually existing in the Church of England, on certain important doctrinal matters, and to make clear the limits within which the varying interpretations may be accepted in true loyalty to the Faith as we have received it. Thus many matters of extreme importance have been either passed over or treated very briefly. The proportions of space given to the different sections may indeed cause misunderstandings as to the more important emphases. Extremists of any type will, of course, not be satisfied. And yet, it seems to the reviewer, it is a book which should be gratefully received by all. It bears clear witness to the true comprehensiveness of the Faith we possess, allowing as it does for many differing points of view within certain carefully determined limits. The Report is, moreover, clear proof that our Church has a supreme interest in theology, that she recognizes the importance of giving due and careful consideration to the advances made by the developing human understanding, and that it is both a privilege and obligation to give reasons for the Faith she professes.

PAUL S. KRAMER.

The Nature of Physical Theory. By P. W. Bridgman. Princeton University Press, 1937, pp. 138. \$2.00.

In this book Dr Bridgman carries still farther the ideas he presented in his earlier book, *The Logic of Modern Physics*. There he taught that it is presumptuous of the scientist to make categorical statements about the nature of reality or even about any fact. All that we can talk about with assurance is the mode of operations by which we deal with facts.

Now our author deals with the nature of physical theory. He claims that no scientific theory is justified in presenting itself as the truth or ultimate pattern of reality. Each is our human effort to do something about the facts we meet with. Even mathematics is an empirical science with no just claims to absolute truth. He says: "We are thus faced with a radically new situation which may well alter the entire future of theory building. Doubtless a great many alternative theories will be possible, and we shall have to choose between them on

grounds of simplicity or convenience of calculation or perhaps on purely esthetic considerations."

And so passes the dogmatism of the science of the nineteenth century.

D. A. MCGREGOR.

An Examination of McTaggart's Philosophy. Vol. II, Parts 1 and 2. By C. D. Broad. Cambridge. University Press; New York: Macmillan, 1938, pp. lxxvi + 796. \$12.50.

Professor Broad is probably the world's expert on the philosophy of McTaggart. He is preëminently suited for the minute examination here presented of McTaggart's most significant work. It is highly technical writing, to be recommended enthusiastically only to those who enjoy watching a finely trained mind severely and uncompromisingly preparing an epitaph over the system of one of the great deductive mentalities of recent centuries.

McTaggart, unversed in science or history and caring nothing for empiricism, built one of the most complex metaphysical systems of recent times. Unlike Hegel, Leibniz, or Kant, it was always clear just what were his presuppositions and how the conclusions were developed from them. It is likely that less empirical evidence than usual was smuggled in as the superstructure was constructed; and as a result of this clear system of deduction it is not difficult to trace out the possible criticisms.

Five years ago, when Broad completed the first volume of his critique of McTaggart, it was the doubtful status of the *Principle of Determining Correspondence* which was most obvious. This Principle is assumed throughout Volume II of *The Nature of Existence*. Therefore, all the developments of the second volume must be considered unproven. But this does not make the examination of Volume II unimportant, because it is such an excellent example of deductive speculation.

Because of the intricacy of Broad's examination and because knowledge of McTaggart's unorthodox Absolute Idealism is presupposed, it is unwise to attempt a detailed analysis. Broad's critique is based upon the same care for the meaning of words as one finds in McTaggart. Such words as "prehension," "exemplified," "chimerical," "ostensibly," and "delusive" are given exact meanings in the *Introduction*. Using his own terms, Broad proceeds to make a detailed analysis of McTaggart's epistemology, psychology, and metaphysics, concluding with remarks about the theories of immortality, God, and value. Even if McTaggart's presuppositions are granted, says Broad, it is doubtful if the conclusions can be established; and some of the chief presuppositions are far from self-evident.

Only one as well versed as Broad in the thought of McTaggart could have made such a splendid analysis. It seems on the whole that Broad's judgments are sufficiently justified. There are times when particular criticisms may be doubtful, but he always seems to be more near to reality than is McTaggart. And in his final evaluation of McTaggart we must concur: McTaggart's system is "thin" just because it is so purely deduction. "A deductive system is fruitful only when the philosopher who constructs it surreptitiously introduces his empirical knowledge or his synthesising hypotheses into his axioms." And McTaggart was always too clear-headed in his mental chess playing to be guilty of that.

RANDOLPH CRUMP MILLER.

An Open Letter to Jews and Christians. By John Cournoos. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938, pp. 183. \$2.00.

This book is well worth reading, though it should be looked upon as an interesting biographical document rather than a successful argument. A portion of the book has already appeared in the form of an essay in the *Atlantic Monthly*. The author is a distinguished Jewish man of letters.

"Jesus was one of us. Who, therefore, knows better than ourselves his true nature?" This sentence appears repeatedly in the book and epitomizes its theme. It envisages a Jewish acceptance of Jesus, though with reservations. Both acceptance and reservations are such as only a decidedly "liberal" Judaism could allow. The Jesus who is accepted is the supposedly purely "human" Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels. Pauline Christianity is vehemently spurned. Indeed, the problem of Christianity, according to the author, is to rescue this human Jesus from S. Paul. The problem of Judaism is to accept him when thus rescued. "Jesus must be resurrected from the sepulchre of dogma and outward forms. In this resurrection the Jew can take a legitimate share, and, far from ceasing to be a Jew by active participation in this, he will by this means, be the better Jew for it. Really a Jew."

The argument is, of course, unacceptable, except perhaps to a Unitarian. Mr. Cournoos seems, indeed, to be quite unaware of recent New Testament scholarship. But argument apart, the book does give vivid glimpses into the tragic dilemma of a modern Jew. He makes a moving plea for a solid front of Judæo-Christianity against the totalitarian states which are beginning to persecute Christian and Jew alike. There are eloquent chapters of protest against the inhumanity of the Marxian gospel and that of the new Germany. There are scattered passages of fascinating autobiography—from childhood in a Russian village, where Christian neighbors shunned the boy as a "Christ-killer," to manhood in the western world where the Jew is again an outcast. Whatever else the book argues, it pays a tribute to Christianity in that one typical Jew at least prefers the persecutors of his childhood to the non-Christian persecutors of the present day.

T. O. WEDEL.

An Introduction to Pastoral Theology. By Henry Balmforth, Lindsay Dewar, Cyril E. Hudson, and Edmund W. Sara. Macmillan, 1937, pp. 305. \$3.50.

The authors of this book have wisely limited their field of study. After stating very clearly the Christian moral ideal and the means existing in the Church for its realization in the individual, they have dealt specifically with the priest's duties in this field. By so limiting themselves they have made an exceedingly valuable contribution to the literature of Pastoral Theology.

After a short but weighty chapter on the continued preparation of the priest for his work, the authors discuss the hearing of confessions. While a good deal of this matter can be found in other works there is a freshness and a practicality about the treatment that makes it exceedingly useful especially to the younger clergy. This reviewer liked particularly the caution advised in allowing inexperienced clergy to hear confession. Some of the English bishops are evidently quite strict about this matter.

The same fine common sense is to be seen in the treatment of visitation of the sick. This chapter could well be added as an appendix to Cabot and Dicks' fine book for it deals with the use of unction and has a very valuable statement on the priest's own attitude toward disease.

Probably the most original contribution of the authors is in the section entitled 'Treatment of Special Cases.' Here the authors who are trained psychologists bring to bear upon such cases the findings of modern psychology. It would not be fair to quote. It is sufficient to say that this advice is wise, well-founded and sufficiently guarded against anything which smacks of quackery.

This reviewer was glad to see that in no sense are the authors 'hide-bound' by tradition or subservient to the view that Anglicans are bound by mediæval canon law—a view which cannot be successfully sustained and which hinders rather than helps in the pastoral work of the Church.

FRANK ARTHUR MCELWAIN.

Step by Step in Sex Education. By Edith Hale Swift. Macmillan, 1938, pp. xii + 207. \$2.00.

This little book is exactly what its name implies. It tells the story of two young parents who feel the responsibility of giving sex education to their two children, beginning when the boy, Bert, who is then two years and three months old, watches his mother nurse his little sister, Jean, who is three months old. This experience leads to a lesson in certain facts about his own anatomy.

In the form of brief dialogues, rarely over four pages long, we are led through practically all the problems of sex that might confront a growing boy or girl up to the time when the two youngsters are away at college, Bert then being over twenty and Jean over eighteen.

Our enlarging knowledge of human nature and its problems makes increasingly evident the necessity of frank education in regard to our sexual life and relations. One does not have to go so far as Freud in believing that sex is basic in most of life's problems; but on the other hand no one can face life's various problems without finding what a tremendous part sex plays in them. At a clergy conference held several years ago the leader asked those present to detail briefly the two most difficult problems they had had to face in their ministry, and twenty out of the twenty-two cases presented involved sex. We realize more and more that vicious or inadequate sex training in childhood is responsible for many of the greatest tragedies that come to our boys and girls in later life. Many of them might be avoided, and most of them might be reasonably solved, if clean, frank education in sex were given in early life.

Another conclusion has been reached in regard to sex education—that normally it should be given by parents. It is a subject so intimate, delicate, and personal that it cannot be so well treated by anyone else.

In accepting the heavy but rich responsibility for such education parents could hardly do better than buy Dr Swift's book. It is comprehensive, simple, and the form of statement is both brief and interesting. It is devoutly to be hoped that it will be widely used.

HERMAN PAGE.

What Has Christianity to Say? By F. R. Barry. Harper, 1938, pp. 192. \$2.00.

This book affirms that we need a new kind of evangelism to meet the need of our times, whose heresies are economic, moral, and spiritual. Since politics ultimately rest on theology, that is, what we conceive God to be like, the only safe polity must have God at the center, and man's destiny can only safely be seen in the light of that centrality.

"What is man" therefore is determined by our idea of who is God. If man is a spiritual personality, it is only in the light of the fact that at heart the universe is based on personal values. This God of personal values does not save us by taking us out of our universe but by giving us victory within it through the revelation of its Author's will in Jesus. This is an assumption on which politics must rest, because it is the only real basis which can give us a clue to our destiny and the reason for any form of government.

Dr Barry contends that democracy approximates the kind of community which such a faith would form. One presumes that he would agree with Zimmern in his distinction between "welfare" and "state" nations, assuming the former to be the only safe field for democracy. Projection of any nationalism will not accomplish this, but only the Gospel of a self-revealing God in terms of Jesus Christ. Here again Dr Barry keeps the discussion in the realm of the practical by insisting that Jesus Christ is the revealer of a personal God and is such in the sense of his being the expression of that living relationship possible between God and us, and man and man. Jesus is thus not merely the embodiment of a spiritual ideal but of a Living Will which upholds the world.

This all determines the value of man and makes it plain that he, not technological processes, is central to civilization and that progress is not to be measured in technological terms. Man is himself a specimen of that real life process. This is a religious process which starts not from man but from God. So we have a certain divine vocation.

From this centrality there develops naturally a Christian standard which, opposed to self-interest which would lead the world to Hell, will determine that which is genuinely real. In their conception of Christian standards, Christian people must support their personal religion by these intellectual assumptions. That is, these assumptions must be based on the revelation of life's ruling Spirit as seen in Jesus which discloses no local, but a world Christian view.

Dr Barry's concluding statements offer no concrete solution of the contrast between man's inner need and the world's group action. He points out that in the effort to come at the solution practically the choice must sometimes be between the lesser of two evils in the field of man's group action. He holds the faith that somehow God will work it out.

Dr Barry employs a satisfying use of the traditional phraseology to describe new concepts of the centrality of God to His world and man's place in it accordingly. The last chapter is somewhat disappointing if one has hoped for a clear solution. It is, however, honest in its recognition of organized life as it is, while hopeful that our cooperation with the will of God may yield some accomplishment ultimately.

DONALD B. ALDRICH.

NOTES ON NEW BOOKS

Biblical

Haverford Symposium on Archaeology and the Bible. By William F. Albright, George A. Barton, Henry J. Cadbury, John W. Flight, Albrecht Goetze, Theophile J. Meek, James A. Montgomery, John A. Wilson, and Elihu Grant, Editor. (Biblical and Kindred Studies, No. 6, Haverford College.) New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1938, pp. 245. \$2.00.

This work is a series of reviews of Archaeological work up to date. The chapters are headed uniformly, "The Present State of. . . ." Then follow sections on Syro-Palestinian Archaeology, Old Testament Studies, New Testament Studies, History of Writing in the Near East, Anatolian and Hittite, Mesopotamian, Arabian, and Egyptian Studies. In addition, the editor presents a supplement illustrating ancient Babylonian Business, about 2000 B.C., with text and plates.

Each section is written by a recognized master in the field and each is fully equipped with foot-notes and comprehensive bibliography.

The work becomes immensely valuable as a spring-board to studies in any one of the fields covered and, for the teacher, would seem to take on the character of a "must" book.

A. D. A., JR.

Archæology and the Bible. Seventh edition. By George A. Barton. Philadelphia: Amer. Sunday-School Union, 1937, pp. xxxvi + 607 + 138 pl. \$3.50.

Ever since 1916, when the first edition appeared, this work has remained in the front rank of indispensable text- and reference-books. Edition after edition has kept it up to date, the latest now recounting archæological results during the four years since 1933, especially relative to the Stone Age population of Palestine and the Ras Shamra spring-festival liturgy (which Dr Barton thinks was written for Jerusalem). On the New Testament side there is an account of the Chester Beatty papyri, the Greek fragment of Tatian found at Dura, and the new Rylands papyrus fragment of John. The new edition also contains six additional illustrations. Unfortunately the page headings in ch. xxx contain a glaring—but not misleading!—misprint.

F. C. G.

The Fulness of Israel: A Study of the Meaning of Sacred History. By W. J. Phythian-Adams. Oxford University Press, 1938, pp. xii + 226. \$2.75.

Dr Phythian-Adams defines Sacred History as the history of the Chosen People of God. He traces the history of Israel under the headings, Jahweh's Call, Exodus, Success, Undoing, Servitude. He maintains that our Lord's life followed the same pattern, and that the Christian Church, having passed through the first four stages, is now being called to Servitude. Such a treatment of "Sacred History" is, to say the least, unfortunate.

C. A. S.

Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte. By Herbert Preisker. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1937, pp. vii + 306 + 3 maps. RM 8.

The author insists that he has not endeavored to write another history of Hellenistic culture, but only an account of the background of the N. T. so far as that is required for understanding its world of thought and faith. Hellenism receives far more space (211 pp.) than Judaism (86 pp.). But even at that it is not a history: in lieu of historical chapters there are elaborate and very useful chronological tables. Evidently the author thinks Hellenism the more important of the two, for an understanding of the N. T. Judaism takes its place as one among the many religions of the Empire—Schürer is criticized for interpreting Judaism in terms of the Law and the Messianic hope; whereas it needs to be taken in connection with other oriental religions and the syncretism of the time. However the author is no blind adulator of Hellenism: it was a culture already in decline, and Christianity showed its superiority, on point after point, to the moribund cults and philosophies of the age. 'Germanism' and Christianity were the two powers destined to overcome it (p. 208). Its weakness, for all its brilliant promise, lay in its intellectualism, its individualism, its world-citizen ideal—all of which ran counter to a recognition of the claims of race, folk, nation.—This critique of Hellenism (though it does not supplant such a work as Wendland's) deserves careful consideration. Nazi as it sounds, there *may be* defects in Hellenism that a present-day German can see more clearly than the rest of us. (Epitaphs from the period of the empire show a ninety per cent. foreign element among the plebs; and the figure was steadily rising among the aristocracy!—p. 209.)

But the book is much too brief on the Jewish background. (Oskar Holtzmann's book is better balanced, and is still indispensable.) True, apocalypticism is put in its proper place, and does not preempt the whole foreground, as in most current works on first-century Judaism by Christian writers; and the conception of God is treated with some fairness; but on the whole this part of the work has been done without sympathy. The chapter on the Diaspora is chiefly concerned with Anti-semitism, and its justification; the one on Early Christianity and Judaism aims only to show the superiority of the former. Judaism is viewed through the colored glasses of Pauline polemic—the author's theology, like most traditional German Protestantism, is evidently centered in 'Paulinism,' not in the Gospels; and he evidently shares Nazi prejudices against Jews too fully to see the situation clearly and as a whole in the first century. After all, Christianity owes something to Judaism!

F. C. G.

Toward the Understanding of Jesus. By Vladimir G. Simkhovitch. New ed. Macmillan, 1937, pp. xv + 165. \$1.50.

A new edition of a well-known work first published in 1921. The author distrusts the view that our Lord's teachings were also to be found in Pharisaic Judaism, or in the Old Testament, and condemns the 'approach' of such writers as Wellhausen, McGiffert, G. F. Moore, and E. Meyer. In his view, the situation to which the teachings of our Lord are addressed is the agonizing political one in first-century Palestine (p. 11; cf. p. 72). But when we have finished the book it is not so certain just what Jesus' solution of the political problem was, after all. The author—like many other contemporary interpreters—excuses himself from

what he calls 'text-criticism' (probably meaning literary criticism as well); and the results are what we should expect. When will popular writers on the life of Christ learn that there is a science of historical and literary criticism, and that to ignore it is a mark of the amateur?

It is a pity the new edition does not have a page of corrigenda, to correct (for example) the uniform misspelling of 'Pseudepigrapha.'

F. C. G.

The World in Which Jesus Lived. By Basil Mathews. Abingdon Press, 1938, pp. 130. \$1.50.

A finely illustrated account of the topography, customs and everyday life of Palestine in the days of our Lord. It is just the book to place in the hands of Church School teachers and also of intelligent boys and girls who are interested in the study of the Gospels. Professor Mathews is thoroughly familiar with his subject. He writes an engaging style.

F. C. G.

Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Ed. by Gerhard Kittel. Bd. iii. Lfgn. 16-17. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1938, pp. 961-1104 + viii. M. 5.80.

This installment completes Volume 3 of the new Word Book to the New Testament, now appearing under the editorship of Professor Kittel. It carries through the letter K and is accordingly about half done—as Greek lexicons go. (A-K in the new Liddell and Scott is half the dictionary.)

The present installment is one of the most important in the volume as it contains among others the articles *Kruptō*, *Ktiszō*, and *Kurios*.

The first of these traverses the history of the idea of Hiddenness as involved in both apocalyptic and in the apocryphal literature. In fact the article (which is by Professors Oepke and Meyer) goes into great detail regarding the canonicity of the 'hidden' books of the Old Testament in the Septuagint and in the Ancient Church, apocryphal citations in the New Testament, and a survey of the whole development of the idea of 'apocryphal' books. Like many another of the great articles in this Word Book here is a mass of useful and readily available information.

The article on *Ktiszō* is by Professor Foerster and surveys the Old Testament, Rabbinic, and early Christian concept of God as the Creator. Like much current Continental theology, it is strongly pointed in the direction of God as the 'Wholly Other.' For example (p. 1033): "Man is God's creature. This means that man has no claim as against God. Paul set this forth in his figure of the potter and the clay in Romans 9: 20ff. The figure refers not only to the historical destiny of man, but to the total relationship of man to God. Consequently there is lacking in the New Testament any petition for grace with allusion to the mutual relationship of Creator and creature." This seems a bit far from such phrases in the Gospels as "Fear not, little flock: It is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom," or, "Your heavenly Father knows. . . ."

The article *Kurios*—occupying, with its cognates, sixty pages, and written by Professors Quell and Foerster—is a magnificent survey of the whole development of ideas, and more or less of doctrine, in Old Testament, in Judaism, and in the New Testament and early Christian literature. Of course considerable use is made of Baudissin's great collection of material, and some of the conclusions are

the same—e.g. (p. 1049), "Kyrios as a divine title was no term of extraneous origin which wandered in and came to be applied to Yahweh, but came into common use and survived only where it corresponded to native, non-Greek usage. As applied to deity, Kyrios is essentially a translation of a foreign usage—and nothing more"—Baal, Mar, Adon, etc. Even the name of Yahweh in the Old Testament is discussed, as well as the use of Kyrios in the Septuagint and in the New Testament. It is recognized (p. 1086) that Kyrios was not used as a divine name in Palestine, save through its association with the Bible. In view of its history the term naturally relates to the *exalted* Lord, the head of the Christian community (p. 1090). Though applied to the earthly Jesus, and crossing with such terms as Mari or Rabbi, the liturgical and theological use of the title is to be sharply distinguished from the common usage of 'Sir,' 'Master,' 'Teacher' (p. 1093).

These notes merely skim the surface of a magnificent work which will be a mine of information and a treasure-house of accumulated material for the next fifty years. It is much more than a new edition of Cremer. It is in fact an entirely new work and we sincerely hope that the disturbed economic and political conditions of these days will not prevent its full publication. F. C. G.

Urtextstudium: Sprachlicher Schlüssel zum Griechischen Neuen Testament. Ed. by Fritz Rienecker. Hefte 6-10. Neumünster (Holst.): G. Ihlhoff, n.d.

The first five installments of this useful grammatical guide were noted in an earlier number of the A.T.R. The work is now complete, and may be purchased either in single *Hefte*, at from 80 pf. to M. 1.30, or as a volume at M. 10.50 (clo.) or 14.50 (lea.). There are those who say that such a book is a crutch, and weakens the student. I doubt it. It is useful for a beginner, who soon finds the labor of consulting lexicon and grammar too arduous, and too interrupting, and so merely guesses—or consults a translation. Better for him to consult an accurate grammatical work like the present.—But let him realize that this is only a 'key.' He himself must open the door and walk in! Freedom in reading the N. T. will come in the end, but not without some effort on his part.

This series is to be followed by one on N. T. ideas, and then by one on N. T. archeology. F. C. G.

A Descriptive Catalogue of Greek New Testament Manuscripts in America. By Kenneth W. Clark. Int. by Edgar J. Goodspeed. University of Chicago Press, 1937, pp. xxix + 418 + 72 plates. \$5.00.

This interesting descriptive catalogue of manuscripts in the United States and Canada shows the surprising number of New Testament manuscripts there are on this side of the water. A number of them, thanks to Dr Clark's efforts, have been assigned numbers in the Gregory-Dobshütz list. The dates of these manuscripts of course range from the third century papyri—chiefly at Michigan—to 16th and 17th century lectionaries. There are six complete New Testaments, seventy-eight Four Gospel manuscripts, twelve Apostolos, fifty-four lectionaries and sixteen service books—not counting fragments, the total of which run up to ninety-three. The grand total of manuscripts in this country and Canada is 256—of course including fragments.

At the back of the volume are excellent photographic plates illustrating the more important of these manuscripts. Undoubtedly the book will be useful not only for reference but will stimulate further purchase by American libraries and private collectors, now that it is realized what an excellent start we already have in the collecting of New Testament manuscripts.

F. C. G.

Novum Testamentum Graece. Ed. by Erwin Nestle. 16th Edition. Stuttgart: Priv. Württemberg. Bibelanstalt, 1936, pp. 110 + 678 + 3 maps. M. 2.50. With margin edit., M. 4.

Nestle's Greek Testament is once more in print following a brief period this past autumn when it was said to be unprocurable. It is still, as heretofore, the marvel not only of typography and compactness but also of low price. F. C. G.

Untersuchungen zum Markus-Stil. By Max Zerwick. Rome: Pont. Inst. Bibl., 1937, pp. xi + 145. L. 38.

A careful statistical study of four features in Marcan style, viz. the use of *kai* and *de* as copulatives, direct and indirect speech, the use of the tenses, and word-order.

In spite of the statistical character of the study there are a number of interesting observations, and certain features of Marcan style are brought out clearly. The author holds that Mark never quite completely gets away from the adversative value of *de*; it never becomes wholly equal in value to *kai*. The use of *de*, however, is more often to be explained on psychological than on logical grounds. Occasionally, straight asyndeton is undertaken by Mark in an effort toward a more literary style—this seems a better explanation than the hypothesis of Petrine reminiscence or of an Aramaic original.

The hypotheses of those source critics who rely upon criteria of style in Mark are to be rejected. The historical present, for example, and *hoti*-recitative are characteristic of the Gospel as a whole and cannot be identified with one or another stratum. The same is true of *legei* and *eipen*. Moreover what seems like Hebraism in word-order, at first glance, is really to be explained on the basis of the author's psychology. He neither Latinizes nor Hebraizes, but has his own way of giving emphasis to what he narrates.

Father Zerwick is quite aware that his book will not become a best seller; but he certainly speaks truly in his preface when he insists that without this patient and perhaps painful research we shall not have scientifically reliable data with which to test the hypotheses of those who would split Mark into two, three, or more parallel narratives.

That Mark used sources goes almost without saying. Chief among them, the Church has always maintained, were the reminiscences of St Peter. But that is something very different from the modern partition theories of Wendling, Cadoux, Crum and others, who seem to take their cue from the parallel documents of the Pentateuch, J, E, and P. In other words what they propose is a longitudinal section rather than a lateral. Lateral sections are far more probable in the source analysis of a work written at a time as near the events it describes as the Gospel of Mark.

F. C. G.

The Gospels as History: A Reconsideration. By C. H. Dodd. 18d.

Sadducee and Pharisee: The Origin and Significance of the Names. By T. W. Manson. 18d.

The Royal Injunctions of 1536 and 1538 and 'The Great Bible' 1539 to 1541. By Henry Guppy. 18d.

Israel's Sojourn in Egypt. By H. H. Rowley. 18d.

Browning: The Poet's Aim. By H. B. Charlton. 18d. Manchester: The Manchester University Press. From the John Rylands Library, 1938.

These are reprints from the April *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, Manchester University. Professor Dodd works out a very interesting comparison of Mark and Q, holding that where Mark and Q converge we have the most reliable of historical testimony.

Professor Manson holds that the word Sadducee is a survival of the Aramaized term *syndikos*, that is, a member of the council of leading men of the Jewish nation who had charge of its executive and administrative affairs in the days of the Maccabees. The later etymology (from Zadok) is just pious fancy. He believes, moreover, that Pharisee comes from the word for 'Persian' and reflects the influence of Persian thought upon Jewish religion, chiefly in the area of eschatology. It was because they were innovators in theology that they were called 'Persians' somewhat as the term 'Romanizer' is used today. In due time they accepted the term but gave it a more respectable etymology of their own.

Dr Guppy traces the history of the 'Great Bible' and illustrates it with documents from the Rylands Library.

Professor Rowley deals with the current theories of the Exodus and shows how they affect the whole interpretation of early Hebrew religion. F. C. G.

The Gospel of the Lord Jesus. By Conrad Skinner. Abingdon Press, 1937, pp. 279. \$2.00.

The Introduction is in two parts: (I) Scripture in School, (II) Syllabus and Method; the rest of the book covers the main points of the Gospel by subjects, e.g. Miracle, Faith, The Last Journey. The author is explaining how and what he teaches boys in an English Boarding School in which he has been Chaplain for many years. In the last chapter, 'The Empty Tomb,' too much stress is laid on the 'despair' and 'disillusionment' of the disciples and too little on the primary evidence of St Paul; but on the whole, it is not easy to think of a more useful book than this for one who is teaching the 'Life of Christ' to a class of High School boys.

A. H. F.

Die Metanoia als Zentralbegriff der Christlichen Frömmigkeit. Eine systematische Untersuchung zum Ordo Salutis auf Biblisch-Theologischer Grundlage. By Hans Pohlmann. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1938, pp. viii + 116. M. 6.

Nothing less than a complete rewriting of Systematic Theology is required by the author of this investigation, for according to him Metanoia and not Faith is the one thing needful in the plan of salvation. He gives many definitions of Metanoia: e.g. "Metanoia is nothing else than a result of the Revelation of God on men and just that result which leads to salvation" (p. 88). Metanoia is in fact the recognition of the greatness of God and the littleness of man, and when

this is done, faith, agape, forgiveness, etc. are all included in their proper place. If Metanoia can bear all the meanings which the author gives it, he has made out his case.

A. H. F.

Syrische Grammatik. By Carl Brockelmann. 5th ed. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1938, pp. xiii + 160 + 203. M. 12.

The famous series of grammars, *Porta Linguarum Orientalium*, published heretofore by Reuther and Reichard of Berlin, has been taken over by the firm of Otto Harrassowitz of Leipzig, and is now appearing in new editions. The publisher promises to restore numbers that have gone out of print in the course of the years—including, let us hope, Merx's *Targum Chrestomathy*. At present eleven of the twenty-five or thirty titles are available.

Brockelmann's Syriac Grammar first appeared in 1899, and has long been a vademecum of students. The new fifth edition is not a complete revision; many of the pages are reproduced from the fourth, as was that from earlier editions, by a mechanical process, and the type is beginning to look a bit fuzzy. This method of reprinting was no doubt necessitated by the present combination of high cost of composition and relatively low sales-demand. The main changes are in §§ 29-33, on the Accents, and § 110, under Gender. Other changes are introduced in the Addenda (just over two pages). The Bibliography has been brought down to date, though none of the later editions has kept up the standard of completeness achieved by the first. The Chrestomathy is the same—save for one change on p. 28*—and the Glossary has one page of Addenda.

The Grammar remains, therefore, the same excellent handbook it has proved to be for nearly forty years; and one can only wish the new publishers success with their venture, despite the decline in interest in Semitics, in Germany and elsewhere, at the present time. Perhaps, as we sincerely hope, Dr Brockelmann will live to see his great Syriac Lexicon once more in print, as well.

F. C. G.

Das Neue Testament deutsch: Namen- und Sachregister zum Gesamtwerk. By Gotthold Holtzhey. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1938, pp. 122. Subscription price M. 3.65.

About as an elaborate an index to a New Testament commentary as could possibly be imagined: under "Paulus," for instance, there are more than nine columns of close-packed references. Dr Althaus adds a "Nachwort" in which he tells of the gradual transformation the commentary has undergone since its first inception in 1926, and even since the publication of the first part in 1932: originally planned for the laity, it grew increasingly more and more "theological," until its appeal was predominantly for the clergy. Still, 13,000 copies of the first part have been sold, with the others in due proportion.

B. S. E.

A Little Dictionary of Bible Phrases. Compiled by W. K. L. Clarke. Macmillan, 1938, pp. vi + 89. \$75.

An extremely useful little book in the new series of 'Biblical Handbooks' edited by Bishop Blunt. It is not a Bible dictionary but a dictionary of terms which will help the ordinary Bible reader and also the Church School teacher to a better

understanding of Old and New Testaments. Under *Nasirite* for instance it is pointed out that this is the correct spelling, that it means "one separated" or consecrated, especially under a religious vow. The reader is directed to Numbers 6 for the law on the subject. Biblical references are added and the brief eight-line article concludes, "The origin of the vow was the desire to get back to the purity of the desert life, where no vine-growing was possible." This is a good illustration of the compactness of the dictionary. Another is *Pharaoh*: "The title of the kings of Egypt, meaning 'great house.'" Under *Pharisees*, Dr Abrahams is quoted: "The Gospel attack is directed not on Pharisaism, but against certain Pharisees." We have not read every article but we have read a good many and in every case have found the dictionary to be reliable.

F. G. C.

The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces. By A. H. M. Jones. Oxford University Press, 1937, pp. xi + 556. \$10.00.

Properly speaking, a better title for this work would include some reference to political structure, land tenure and the spread of Greek culture and political ideals. Its primary interest lies in those fields and is rather sharply limited to them.

In the larger sense, the work is an accumulation of facts concerning political organization and economic structure of cities of the east, from the Hellenistic period through the Byzantine, culled largely from classical writers and inscriptions.

For the student of classical geography the work should prove invaluable, though the author confesses it is a preliminary study and only partly digested. For the student of cities it will prove of value chiefly in fixing location and in the revelations of political structure in this specific period. It cannot, however, prove altogether satisfying, since its pre-Classical background receives scant attention, with the exception of certain observations concerning the Persian period, and no attention is given to physical description of cities. For these other important elements, the student must turn to earlier inscriptions and to archaeological reports.

A. D. A., JR.

Judaism

The Mishneh Torah by Maimonides: Book I. The Book of Knowledge. Ed. by Moses Hyamson. New York: Bloch, 1937, pp. v + 372 + xiii. \$5.00.

"From Moses unto Moses there arose not one like Moses"—this old Jewish proverb is a tribute to the great Moses Maimonides, the founder of Jewish scholastic philosophy. He was born in Cordova in 1135 under the last Fatimite Caliph and suffered exile along with many of his fellow Spanish Jews, going first to Fez and later to Cairo. Here he rose to great eminence not only as a scholar and a teacher but also as personal physician to Saladin. So close was his relation to the great caliph that he married the sister of one of Saladin's secretaries.

His *Mishneh Torah* was written in Cairo and finished in 1177. It is chiefly valuable as a codification of the 248 positive and 365 negative precepts of the Torah. These are grouped in fourteen books, the text and translation of the first of which lies before us in Dr Hyamson's excellent edition. The work begins with an introduction on the subject of the Oral Law, tracing the links in the chain of tradition from Moses to "Rabbi, called Our Teacher, the Saint"—this is Rabbi Judah, the compiler of the Mishnah. The further development of the

tradition until its final full embodiment in the Babylonian Talmud is sketched, and then follows the author's explanation of his own reasons for writing the *Mishneh Torah*: "In our days, severe vicissitudes prevail and all feel the pressure of hard times. . . . The commentaries of the Geonim and their compilations of Laws and Responses . . . have in our times become hard to understand." He called his book *Mishneh Torah*, "Repetition of the Law," for the reason that "a person who first reads the Written Law and then this compilation, will know from it the whole of the Oral Law, without having occasion to consult any other book between them" (f. 4b).

The book gives a clear insight into mediæval Judaism in the days of its glory, faced with persecution but rallying once more about the sacred Law. The book is historically important because for centuries it was the exposition of Judaism best known among Christian theologians. I have called it an example of Jewish scholasticism; the noun is not meant as an epithet; the work is one of the great classics of the Jewish religion and will well repay Christian scholars who take the trouble to read at least Dr Hyamson's clear and idiomatic translation.

F. C. G.

The Highways to Perfection of Abraham Maimonides. Ed. and tr. by Samuel Rosenblatt. Columbia University Press, 1927, Vol. I, pp. ix + 214. \$3.50. Vol. II, Johns Hopkins Press, 1938, pp. ix + 441. \$5.00.

Abraham Maimonides was the son of Moses Maimonides and wrote a *Comprehensive Guide for the Servants of God*, the first part of which Dr Rosenblatt has entitled in his translation 'The Highways to Perfection.' What the younger Maimonides undertook to do was to show the inner meaning and aim of the precepts of the Torah, going beyond the observance of its commandments in the external sense and yet insisting that the counsels of perfection may only be undertaken after the ordinary virtues have been achieved. There is much in the work that reminds us of the Schoolmen and mystics of the contemporary mediæval Church.

Like his father, Abraham was a physician and also Nagid of the Jewish community in Egypt. Like his father also he was greatly interested in dietetics and believed that physical and mental health and spiritual progress all alike depend in considerable measure upon the proper use, and avoidance of abuse, of food.

The book should appeal to every person interested in the history of mediæval thought and likewise to all who are interested in the actual practice of the spiritual life. As Dr Rosenblatt says, the work is not very original. Neither its metaphysics nor its ethics offers us anything startling, nor do its scientific theories; but from it we gain the impression of a devout and earnest Jew of the early thirteenth century (he died in 1237), and a mind worth knowing. There is a fascinating little thumbnail sketch of him by a fellow physician, the Arab biographer Ibn Abi Useibia: "He was employed in the service of the King Alkamil Mohammed ibn Abi Bekr ibn Ayyub and also came frequently from the palace to the hospital which is in Cairo to treat the sick in it. And I met him in the year 631 or 632 in Cairo while I was healing in the hospital there and I found him to be a tall old gentleman, lean in body, good as company, witty in speech, and distinguished in medicine" (i. 123).

F. C. G.